THEOLOGY

VOL. LI DECEMBER, 1948 No. 342

Note

AFTER December 15th the Editor's address will be: 8, The Cloisters, Windsor Castle, Berks. It is requested that thenceforward all communications intended for him be sent there.

Editorial

WE found the surprising result of the American presidential election cheering on what may be called pre-political grounds; we are not here concerned with its direct political significance. To begin with, it was entirely unexpected—except apparently by President Truman himself. A world in which men and nations did not do unexpected things would be dreadful, and it has been easy to fear that we were moving into such a world.

But the choice of the American people was not only unexpected or contrary to what observers with or without a flair for guesswork had confidently predicted; it was a flat contradiction of what had been accepted as scientifically certain. On the morning of the day on which the result became known, the *Manchester Guardian* headed its report from its New York correspondent: SOOTHSAYING TURNED INTO A SCIENCE BY PUBLIC OPINION POLLS. Alistair Cooke, whose reports from the U.S.A. are one of the best things in contemporary journalism, wrote that 1936 (the year of the Roosevelt-Landon debacle) was probably the last year in American history before soothsaying became a science. "This election has many of the features of that election of twelve years ago, but what takes the sting out of it is the knowledge that it is so twenty-four hours before the votes are counted. Among this people with a mechanical genius, Mr Elmo Roper is the voice of the people. He has spoken, and today he lies back and taps his teeth and waits for the people to make their mark and catch up with him."

We do not deny that the methods used in at least some public opinion polls are entitled to be called scientific. It is, in fact, salutary and cheering to have this striking notification that the social sciences are much more fallible than the natural sciences. The notion that infallible prediction about social conduct is possible leads easily to the conclusion that social engineering is not only possible but inevitable. An event like this, which chastens the confidence of would-be social engineers and shows that even "mass-society" is capable of acting incalculably, is welcome. It is a reminder that there are and always will be limits to human understanding of, and power over,

society. It is also a reminder of the rashness and presumption of generalizations about classes and nations. Men may have very different thoughts and aspirations from those that meet the eye, especially the eye of the collector of statistics. Mass-observation, while its findings are not to be despised, is not to be taken too seriously.

It is unlikely that agreement will ever be reached about the causes of this particular confutation of the prophets, but the personalities of the candidates certainly had something to do with it. To an external observer who followed the course of the presidential contest as best he might, it would seem that of the two chief candidates one represented cold and impersonal efficiency and the other warm, somewhat inept, but very likeable humanity. Neither of these is the qualification that is most to be desired in a statesman, but if a choice has to be made between them it seems to us cheering that the American people should prefer the latter. The seeds of totalitarianism are in favourable soil when a technological society regards efficiency as the greatest value; the instincts of such a society are still sound when, whatever the risks involved, it betrays its preference for a human person subject to feelings like its own and overtly fallible like itself. In a word, the American election affords encouragement to all who would believe, but find it difficult to believe, that personality is still the most potent factor in the world. There is a shortage of such encouragement in the public events of our time.

* * * * *

We call special attention to the article which follows on "The Supply and Distribution of Assistant Curates." The facts disclosed show the ecclesiastical system is lamentably inefficient; that is to say, it is not doing what it is intended to do as well as it might, even with its straitened resources. But we are less worried by the inefficiency of the system than by the appalling strain that is being imposed on a large number of incumbents in industrial parishes. Nothing can make the task of the ordained ministry easy in these days; this is all the more reason why dioceses and parishes should seek to bear one another's burdens, instead of leaving the distribution of assistant curates to the freedom of the market. We hope that what the Archdeacon of York says will be carefully pondered not only in the central councils of the Church, but also in theological colleges and by ordination candidates.

The Supply and Distribution of Assistant Curates

THE Lambeth Encyclical Letter asserts that "if the supply of men called and equipped for the ministry is lacking, all Christian strategy must, humanly speaking, suffer." In the lower sphere of tactical operation the incumbents of large parishes, and diocesan authorities, have for a long time been anxious about the supply of ordinands, and all church people must be made to realize how desperate the situation is. There was a severe shortage of curates after the 1914-18 war, and it was not until 1932 that ordinands had to seek for titles instead of hard-pressed incumbents advertising persistently, or else poaching assistant shepherds from neighbouring pastures, in order to make up depleted staffs. Yet the plight of the incumbent is far worse today; the recent war was of longer duration, and adequate replacements of our manpower are not in sight. It will be a long time before the 2,175 men who have been recommended by Selection Centres are all through their training, and when these are absorbed the Central and Diocesan Councils for the Training of the Ministry have the great responsibility of finding and training something like 600 men per annum if we are to make good our deficiencies.

This shrinkage in our manpower is illustrated by the fact that only 3,573 men were ordained in the last decade, 1938-47, while in the ten years 1930-39 there were 5,737, a decrease of 2,164. The total number of curates employed in 1938 was 4,554, but in January, 1948, there were only 2,189, a loss of 2,365, which is, of course, very serious. The average number ordained in the two immediate years pre-war was 590, while in the two years post-war it had dropped to 183.

One of the bad results of the situation is that the average age of the clergy has gone up and there is an alarming proportion of middle-aged and elderly men. A good number have retired, but many have been compelled to cling to their livings because they cannot afford to retire, or cannot find suitable houses to go to, but on the other hand the Church is glad of their services, and there are instances of retired men coming back to the active list. This acute shortage, as well as financial stringency, has made the joining up of parishes inevitable. It would be comparatively easy to fill some vacant benefices from the ranks of the curates, many of whom are of senior status and married, but it is no remedy for our ills to take a man from a curacy in a large parish for work in a less vital sphere. The only solution is to recruit large numbers of young men who are eager to work where they are most needed. It can easily be demonstrated where these needs are and where our losses of manpower have been greatest—in the large parishes of the industrial areas, principally in the north, but also in certain southern dioceses.

Many will be familiar with the old stipulation, when incumbents sought an exchange of benefice or a curate new work, "Not north!" The writer remembers an eloquent sermon on this theme by Dr Lang, when Archbishop of York, preaching to undergraduates at

Oxford in 1922, which moved some of us to venture into his province. But too many prefer the more attractive parishes of the south to the drab towns and hard work of the north. "Why does the priest always face north when he reads the Gospel?" asked a curate in a southern parish when catechizing his children. "Please, Father, because the Protestants live in the north," was the bright reply. And no doubt many people in the south really believe that not only Protestants but other uncouth folk live in the "wild and woolly north," occasionally invading London for a Cup Final, but normally at a safe distance. There are other and better reasons why some clergy do not go north. A man can only choose to go where he can find not only work but an adequate stipend and, if married, a house as well. Quite a number of the service candidates were prepared to work in the north but had to go south for a house and a suitable stipend. Even so, of the 905 men now in training who have been accepted for a particular diocese, 312, or 34·5 per cent., are due to work in the north. And this is not unusual, for statistics show that of all the men ordained during the past twenty years over 35 per cent. have gone north. Yet in spite of this fact the proportion of curates employed in the north was only 29·32 per cent. in 1938, and this has fallen to 26·4 per cent. in 1948. This may be due to a drift south after ordination, and also because the supply is never sufficient to make an appreciable increase. There is, in consequence, this unfair disproportion between the numbers of men working in the two provinces. The total population of England is 37,600,375, of whom 13,923,765, or 37·03 per cent., are in the Province of York, but there are only 3,974 out of 14,972 parochial clergy, or 26·54 per cent. There is a startling difference between the average number of people served by one priest, and the average size of the parishes, in the two provinces and between different dioceses. This can best be seen by a table, in which the number of curates, already included in the total of priests, is also given for purposes of comparison.

Diocese.	*People to each Priest.*	*Average Parish.*	*Curates.*
Hereford	660	666	11
Bath and Wells ...	920	940	45
Salisbury	970	1,047	28
St Edmundsbury ...	994	1,021	23
Gloucester	1,041	1,202	40
Oxford	1,073	1,266	116
Ely	1,141	1,105	15
Peterborough ...	1,250	1,237	25
Norwich	1,266	1,237	25
Exeter	1,302	1,476	65
Lincoln	1,375	1,203	32
Truro	1,375	1,450	27
Chichester	1,642	1,930	84
St Albans	1,706	2,033	60

Diocese.	*People to each Priest.*	*Average Parish.*	*Curates.*
Worcester	1,735	2,086	36
Winchester	1,796	2,170	57
Coventry	2,002	2,416	30
Leicester	2,081	2,173	21
Guildford	2,213	2,951	48
Bristol	2,345	2,880	55
Rochester	2,458	3,072	56
Canterbury	2,505	2,706	60
Derby	2,615	2,923	31
Lichfield	2,651	3,178	92
Portsmouth	2,740	3,379	36
Chelmsford	2,932	3,370	75
London	5,030	6,841	216
Southwark	5,327	7,497	164
Birmingham ...	5,362	6,980	38
Sodor and Man ...	1,337	1,882	4
Carlisle	1,426	1,511	17
York	2,335	2,253	54
Ripon	2,458	3,114	36
Southwell	2,571	3,029	42
Newcastle	3,038	4,040	41
Chester	3,040	3,620	54
Bradford	3,331	3,860	24
Blackburn	3,416	4,097	53
Wakefield	3,573	4,528	53
Durham	4,658	5,463	54
Sheffield	4,978	6,012	43
Manchester	5,375	6,223	45
Liverpool	5,411	7,152	58

These averages are based on calculations from figures in the 1948 *Official Year Book*, amended in some cases from diocesan information, while the number of curates is from the last diocesan returns to the Church Commissioners. There is, in the whole country, an average of one parochial clergyman, including curates, to 2,511 people, and the average population of all the parishes is 2,871. It is obvious that most southern cures are well below the average, whether as parishes or counting priests to people, and also that the distribution of curates, which should restore the balance, is also disproportionate. If some form of direction were possible, as in the army, Civil Service, or teaching profession, there would be drastic revision. Oxford would not have 116 curates and Birmingham only 38, and many would be moved north to staff the huge parishes there. It was hoped, when all the dioceses were asked to contribute their quota to the Central Service Candidates Fund, that these men would be shared out in something like the same proportion, but this is not the case, and some dioceses have a sense of grievance. They have

helped to train men to work in dioceses which can afford to offer better conditions. This is no fault of the Central Council, and, as stated earlier, many of the men would have gone north if they could. Meanwhile, numbers continue to decline steeply in the industrial dioceses. Durham had 141 curates in 1938 and now has 54, Liverpool has dropped from 158 to 58, Manchester from 161 to 45, Sheffield 106 to 43, York 122 to 54, and Birmingham from 178 to 38. These are the January figures, and it is known that there are considerably fewer today. It means that these dioceses have only 33 per cent. of their pre-war curate strength, while most southern dioceses average 60 per cent.

It is true that there are far more small parishes in the south, and while the ideal of a parson to every village was possible, and while there was a sufficient stipend for each, or men of means to accept the poorer so-called "livings" and no great call for their services elsewhere, no one could complain if thousands of our clergy spent their lives in small villages to the great benefit of their people. But now that we are short of thousands of men, and England is rapidly becoming a mission field, our strategy must be changed. Even in the country dioceses the shortage is being felt and parishes have to be linked or grouped. A larger proportion of clergy is necessary in the pastoral work of scattered districts, and if the experiment of grouping country parishes with a staff of clergy is persevered with, a larger number of assistant curates will be needed in the country, and yet, surely, the clamant need for the bulk of our curates is in the big parishes. We are not using what manpower we have on any rational basis, and this applies in almost any diocese.

In the diocese of York, which is an average diocese in its manpower and variety of parishes, there is the same disparity as in the country generally. The two deaneries of Hull and Middlesbrough contain 530,655 people, slightly more than half the population of the diocese, and yet have only 75 of the 440 clergy in the diocese, and the other 25 deaneries are vastly better staffed. There is only one parson to 7,600 people in Hull, and one to 6,331 in Middlesbrough, while York has one to 3,218 and a typical country deanery one to 800. The situation is worse in other dioceses, such as Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield, Birmingham, Southwark, and London; and in all the big towns there are men struggling single-handed with many thousands of people. The priest who would read the Gospel to the heathen must now face in all directions, and, we hope, go out to convert them.

What is to be done about it? More men, of course, and more who are ready to work under depressing conditions. There was once a glamour attaching to "slumming" in London, and a fine type was attracted. The north never had the same appeal, and yet Cosmo Lang as a Leeds curate and William Temple as Manchester's bishop have testified to the worthwhileness of work amongst virile northerners. It is remarkable how men who have worked in towns like Wigan and Middlesbrough, heartily despised by J. B. Priestley, have such warm affection for the people and the place; and the

place because of the grand folk who live there. It is doubtful if anything in the south can compare with the vigorous, enthusiastic, and loyal response experienced by priests who have won the confidence of northern people, and there is nothing to equal the Sunday Schools of Lancashire or the amazing efforts for the Church by Yorkshire people when roused. The northern dioceses need to send out their "scouts" or "recruiting sergeants" to schools, universities, and theological colleges to make the claims and advantages of the north better known.

But few men can now afford to work in great parishes, whether in Hull, Manchester, or in Portsea, on a nominal stipend, and, as a good proportion of ordinands in the future may be married men who have given up their work and prospects, and sometimes comfortable circumstances, to serve in the ministry, adequate pay and houses must be secured for them. They should not be expected to start at the nominal rate of pay usual in professions leading to a high salary, but rather in line with the teaching profession, and we need our "Burnham" scale. Freedom from abject poverty must be guaranteed, even if some are willing, and we hope there will be such, to embrace poverty for the Gospel's sake whether in the overseas mission field or at home. Yet if an adequate number of men were willing to go to the large and poorer parishes where they are most urgently needed, some of these parishes would be unable to take them because they could not raise the balance of the money required to meet such grants as are usually available. The policy of the Church Commissioners is to pay block grants to dioceses, based on the number of full-time curates and lay-workers employed, and to leave the dioceses the responsibility of apportioning these, in conjunction with their own grants, among the parishes. This is reasonable and equitable, but as I have already pointed out, most of the available curates are working in the dioceses and parishes best able to afford them, so the tendency is to strengthen these dioceses and parishes and leave the others unaided. True, the Commissioners also give supplementary grants, which are of the utmost value to the hard-pressed diocese, and the A.C.S. and C.P.A.S. give all the help they can, and yet there would seem to be the need for the Central Authorities, C.A.C.T.M., and the Commissioners, and the dioceses combining to work out and apply a common strategy. It will not be easy: the weak parishes are not the best training grounds for young deacons, and the well organized "live" parishes and some smaller parishes are not only more attractive but more suitable, and yet the Church must strive to reinforce these dangerously weak places and strengthen the whole battle-front. Direction of man-power is not practicable, yet from my own experience, and from the facts I have given, I am certain that when men are called into the sacred ministry they are willing to serve where most needed if the way is made possible.

G. F. Townley.

The Universality of Sin

In recent years it has become evident that a change is working in human thought, a change of emphasis which amounts in effect to a change of direction. Various writers have given impressive expression to the need, not for an ever more detailed examination of isolated portions of reality, but for the working out of a comprehensive view of reality as a whole. The demand is for synthesis, rather than analysis, in human thinking, although of course it is not assumed that the two can ever be completely exclusive; and the argument is that since the old view of things has broken down under the impact of new detailed knowledge of the parts, gathered by analytic methods, the time has come to attempt the urgent task of intellectual reconstruction.

This is a matter which concerns philosophy and to which the theologian cannot for long remain indifferent. It is therefore not surprising to find theologians among the ranks of those who make the demand for synthesis, and to find them making this demand from the various standpoints of their different interests. Thus Bishop Barry declares that "half the confusion of the world today" is due to the fact that the Church has not supplied "an interpretation or synthesis which gives significance to the whole of life";[1] while, from the point of view of a Christian moralist, Professor E. S. Waterhouse has argued that "the reunion of ethics with the Christian ethics which, historically, did so much to enrich ethical thought will make for the lasting enrichment of both."[2]

Unusual interest, however, attaches to a contribution to this general theme which comes from the hands of a philosopher, Mr H. D. Lewis, and which is concerned not so much with the gulf between philosophy and theology, nor yet with that between ethics and Christian ethics, but with the gulf between morals and theology. "It is evident," he writes,[3] "that the time has now come for a new synthesis in all the main departments of thought and action, a fusion of the main forces of civilization that will direct them to a higher stage." And to this end it seems to him that there is "no more urgent matter in the field of theological study than to relate the main features of contemporary theology to what we feel bound to believe about the moral life, to bridge what appears at the moment an impassable gulf."[4] The contention is that theology in its most influential forms flatly contradicts certain tenets which are hardly less than axiomatic for the moral philosopher. In particular, Mr Lewis holds that much theological teaching is rendered almost incomprehensible to the moralist because it flies in the face of such firmly held ethical convictions as the belief in the freedom of man's will, the belief that people vary in their moral character, some being better than others, and the belief that each individual is, strictly speaking, responsible only for what he himself has done or failed to do.

[1] *Church and Leadership*, p. 86.
[2] *Philosophy*, April, 1943, p. 59.
[3] *Morals and the New Theology*, p. 16.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

Now this treatment of the subject is valuable, partly because morals provide a battleground of strategic importance, perhaps *the* battleground of strategic importance for the settlement of the issue between a religious understanding of reality and an understanding which grants no validity to religious insight. The treatment is valuable also coming as it does from the hands of a philosopher, and so providing the theologian with a plain and fairly detailed statement of the difficulties which the moralist finds in the contentions of the former. And it is the purpose of this paper to examine the thesis, in particular, that the theological concept of the universality of sin is seriously at odds with an essential ethical tenet—namely, that men vary in their moral character and that some are better than others, and that therefore ethics must always treat with grave suspicion any "pronouncement about the moral character of 'man,' of 'humanity,' and the 'race.' "[1]

The particular form of the theological concept which Mr Lewis chooses for attack is that expounded by Professor Niebuhr. Niebuhr is conscious of the fact that the doctrine of the universality and equality of sin seems to fly in the face of the moral distinctions drawn by the ordinary moral consciousness, and he sets himself to deal with this difficulty. He maintains that whereas Roman Catholic casuistry "constantly insinuates religious absolutes into highly contingent and historical moral judgments,"[2] orthodox Protestantism tends "to efface all moral distinctions of history in the light of a religious conviction of the undifferentiated sinfulness of all men";[3] and he endeavours himself to steer a cautious course between these two opposite errors. In doing this he lays it down as his major point in this connexion that while there is equality of sin there is at the same time inequality of guilt; and guilt he distinguishes from sin "in that it represents the objective and historical consequences of sin, for which the sinner must be held responsible."[4] "Guilt," he says,[5] "is the objective consequence of sin, the actual corruption of the plan of creation and providence in the historical world." Thus it is possible to hold that, although men are equally sinners, they are not equally guilty.

In reply to all this Lewis objects strongly to what he calls the "misuse of the word 'guilt.' " "In the normal and accepted usage this word refers to a quality of the will of the agent and not to the objective consequences of action."[6] The argument is that instead of displaying a variation in the moral value of persons Niebuhr has displayed only a moral variation in the outward consequences of their actions; but by using the word "guilt," which is connected with the former variation, in order to denote the latter, Niebuhr confuses the issue and leaves the impression that he has room in his theory for a variation in the moral quality of persons.

Now there is considerable force in this argument. In particular, it

[1] *Morals and the New Theology*, p. 59.
[2] *Nature and Destiny of Man*, I, p. 234.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 235. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 235. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 236.
[6] *Morals and the New Theology*, pp. 62 f.

is quite true that as they stand Niebuhr's definitions of guilt misrepresent what is ordinarily understood by the word. In any customary sense guilt neither *represents* nor *is* an objective and historical consequence. On the other hand, Lewis is also wrong in saying that the word refers to a quality of the will of an agent. At any rate it does not refer to a simple quality, and wherever it is said that X is guilty it is always to be understood that the statement is elliptical. The notion of guilt is a transitive one, and if the use of the word always presupposes a person who is, or is thought to be, guilty, it also presupposes some objective circumstance of which the person in question is, or is thought to be, guilty. There is no meaning in the assertion that someone is guilty, if abstraction is made from all objective consequences. The concept of guilt is more complicated than would appear from either of the suggested definitions, whether as a quality of will or as an objective consequence. Indeed, it is more accurate to say that guilt is a relation, a relation of responsibility, in which a person may stand to certain outward and morally defective circumstances. That the notion of guilt is complex in this way seems evident from the analysis of the matter; but it also seems indicated by the fact that quite often we use the word in a partial and playful sense when we accept or reject responsibility for circumstances which are not morally defective at all, for if guilt were a simple quality of the agent's will we could not use the idea in any partial sense whatsoever. Consequently, in the concept of guilt there is after all an indefeasible reference to outward circumstances; and so far Niebuhr is right enough. Indeed, his only error seems to be that instead of regarding guilt as *carrying a reference to* objective consequence he regards it as *being identical with* objective circumstance.

As a matter of fact, however, on examination it does not appear that Niebuhr is really guilty even of this error, for, certainly, his use of the word "guilty" is found to be much nearer the ordinary usage of the word than his formal definitions would lead one to expect. Throughout this section of his work Niebuhr consistently applies the word "guilty," not to outward circumstances, but to people in relation to outward circumstances; and nowhere, outside of his definition, does he allow the word to denote objective and historical consequence. "An abandoned wife may share equal guilt with her faithless husband."[1] "Men who are tempted by their eminence . . . become more guilty of pride and of injustice than those who lack power and position."[2] "The pretensions of the spiritual leaders of culture and civilization may be more productive of evil than the simpler will-to-power of the mighty and the noble."[3] "Those who hold great economic and political power are more guilty of pride against God and of injustice against the weak than those who lack power and prestige."[4] In all these examples, and in others without exception, the guilt is attached to persons, although there is, as there should be according to our argument, an inalienable reference to outward circumstance.

[1] *Nature and Destiny of Man*, I, p. 236.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 237.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 238.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 240.

More than that, it is to be noted that in every instance in Niebuhr's treatment of this matter, not only is the guilt attached to persons rather than consequences, but also it is the guilt which is more or less and subject to degree, and not the badness of the outward circumstances. Always Niebuhr's statement is of the form that A is more guilty of X, being evil, than B, not of the form that A is guilty of more evil than B. So consistent is his usage on this matter that one can only suppose that it is no accident, that it follows rather from some hidden element in his total view. Indeed, although Lewis is quite mistaken in alleging that the only variations and inequalities allowed by Niebuhr are "variations in the outward 'more and less' of justice that we produce," "variations in the actual effects of action,"[1] an excuse for the misinterpretation is to be found, not only in the wording of Niebuhr's formal definitions of guilt, but also in the fact that Niebuhr nowhere explains why he should say "A is more guilty than B" rather than "A is guilty of more evil than B." There is, in fact, just one hint, and no more than a hint, of Niebuhr's reason for this choice, for if, when Niebuhr says that guilt is the objective consequence of sin, we are to take him as really meaning that it is responsibility for the objective consequence of sin, then when he says that it is "the actual corruption of the plan of creation and providence in the historical world,"[2] we may take him as meaning that it is responsibility for this, and if, as seems at least possible, he is treating this "actual corruption of the plan of creation and providence" as a single phenomenon, as a whole, not as broken up into bits and pieces for which different people are responsible, then there is nothing left to vary save the responsibility for it. Moreover, whether or not this is a correct interpretation of Niebuhr's thought on this question, it does seem right, if the plan of creation and providence is to be regarded as one comprehensive plan, to regard the corruption of it as one comprehensive corruption, though doubtless at the same time as a corruption in many different respects; and so to regard the matter is in harmony with the moral principle of organic wholes clearly laid down by Professor G. E. Moore, the principle, namely, that "a whole has an intrinsic value different in amount from the sum of the values of its parts."[3]

Thus, it will be seen, Niebuhr goes a long way toward the admission into his system of something which is subject to variation and may correspond to the varying virtue and vice of individual persons which the moralist is concerned to examine; and in this way Niebuhr largely escapes untouched from the criticisms which Lewis levels against him. Whether or not he completely escapes is, however, another question, for it would seem that in his conception of guilt there is an element of contingency. The extent of a man's guilt depends upon the area of external circumstance which falls within his sphere of effective influence, and that may depend a great deal upon such accidents as those of birth, station, and so on. The variations in

[1] *Morals and the New Theology*, p. 63.
[2] *Nature and Destiny of Man*, I, p. 236.
[3] Moore: *Principia Ethica*, p. 36.

guilt in other words seem to reduce largely, if not completely, to differences of opportunity. It is therefore open to Lewis to contend that these accidental inequalities are not exactly what the moralist considers when he examines the varying virtue of human beings, which is not accidental but belongs intrinsically to their characters, for the same degree of virtue may be found in men of high and low estate.

At this point, however, there arises a difficulty regarding the case which Lewis may present, for although he holds that virtue or moral goodness varies in degree and even describes that conviction as the "presumption upon which ordinary ethical thinking proceeds,"[1] quoting with approval Tennant's observation that the theory of the equal sinfulness of men "would seem to make an end at once of ethics and Christian theology,"[2] yet as a matter of fact (i) it seems clear that much ethical thinking does not require the assumption that virtue varies in degree,[3] and (ii) it seems extremely difficult to give any precise meaning to the phrase "morally better." No doubt, so far as the latter point is concerned, the phrase is sometimes applied to a pure or unmixed motive as compared with an impure one, or, more loosely, to a good motive as compared with a bad one. This latter usage, however, is a loose one, for what is really meant is that while one motive is good the other is bad. But the application of the phrase "morally better" to cases in which a pure motive is contrasted with an impure one is not in principle different from, indeed is only a more complicated instance of, this loose misleading usage. For to say that mixed motive B is less morally good than pure motive A is not to imply that there are degrees of moral goodness but is rather to assert that B has at least two "parts," and that of these one is morally good whereas the other is morally bad or neutral.

Lewis himself admits that comparisons in point of virtue are not easy. "On the contrary," he says,[4] "it must be admitted that they are extremely difficult"; but, he maintains, "the difficulty of ascertaining the facts and ascribing to the facts that we can discover their proper importance . . . does not in any way affect the finality of the distinctions of value which do qualify those facts."[5] What we are maintaining, however, is not that comparisons in point of virtue are "extremely difficult," but that they are as a matter of fact impossible. It may be that we can compare men in respect of *a* virtue. Thus we can perhaps significantly affirm that A is more generous than B, or that X is a better son than Y; but when we seem to be saying that A is a better man than, is absolutely more virtuous than, B, we are in reality judging them from a restricted and relative point of view. By and large, we are either comparing different individuals in respect of

[1] *Morals and the New Theology*, p. 61.

[2] *The Concept of Sin*, p. 265; quoted by Lewis, p. 61.

[3] To deny that there are degrees of virtue is not of course to deny that there is any difference between virtue and vice; although, in his article on "Collective Responsibility" (*Philosophy*, January, 1948; cf. pp. 4, 5), Mr. Lewis does seem to pass too easily from a consideration of the one denial to a consideration of the other.

[4] *Morals and the New Theology*, p. 60.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 61.

a single virtue or considering the different possibilities of virtuous action open to a single individual in a given particular situation, and in this latter case, if we say that virtue A is better than virtue B, we really mean that action consonant with virtue A is *right* and action consonant with virtue B is *wrong, in the given situation.* But to try to weigh different virtues, not at all as they bear upon a certain practical situation, but as they enter into character as a whole, is a different matter, and, it seems, one in which we are confronted by insuperable obstacles. It may seem plausible to assume that because we can compare men in respect of *a* virtue, it must be ideally possible to compare them in respect of absolute virtue; but how could we possibly take all virtues into account and balance "amounts" of one virtue against "amounts" of some other virtue? Who can say that so many degrees of gratitude are equal in goodness to a certain degree of generosity? Indeed, who can say what is to be meant by a "degree" of any virtue? This is, of course, a difficulty with regard to moral goodness similar to that which critics have generally found in certain forms of utilitarianism in respect of the doctrine of a hedonistic calculus; and if Lewis is right in maintaining that the very existence of ethics requires that we should be able to compare men in respect of virtue in general, absolute virtue, then it is not simply certain ethical theories, but ethics as a whole, which is confounded.

Yet, clearly, we cannot be content simply to leave the different virtues as an unco-ordinated heap; and, it seems, sooner or later the question arises, If the various virtues lack a common denominator, may they not have a common source and spring? Now it is at this point that Christian thinking comes to the aid of the moralist, for, from the standpoint of Christianity, the virtues are, so far as they are genuinely virtuous, simply the fruits of the Spirit, or when we try to describe the matter purely from the human side, as in the present connexion we are bound to do, they are the fruits of faith. If, however, faith is the source and spring of the various virtues, is faith then a measurable factor, or at any rate can we compare different individuals in respect of faith? The answer is that no doubt we can, for it is significant to describe one individual as more a man of faith than another, but that it is not easy for human beings to make the comparison, that indeed in the end this judgment must be reserved to Him who is alone able to scrutinize the heart and read the secret of man's soul.

None the less, faith is there as the root of the matter; but, it must be noted, while Christian thinking comes in this way to the aid of the moralist, in doing so it reveals the moral life in a new light. Faith cannot be separated from its own inherent insights; and in the present context there are several points of importance. Thus, by faith we know what we are or would be without faith, all equally sinners, falling short of the glory of God. By faith we know what our purely natural "virtue" is or would be, totally corrupted by pride, self-will, and selfishness. By faith also we know what faith itself is, that it is the gift of God lest any man should boast.

Thus the doctrine of the universality of sin is not the result of a detached examination of human virtue and vice; it is rather an insight of faith. And if moralists are very suspicious of all "pronouncements about the moral character of 'man,' " it is because they wrongly regard such pronouncements as the conclusions of an empirical and impartial examination of the state of human virtue. In reality, however, the theologian's judgment that all men are equally sinners is a deliverance of the religious consciousness which can assume the universal form because it is made at a deeper level than that at which occur the differences between one man and another, because in other words it grasps an essential moment in the relation between man and God. Whether this moment is to be regarded as a logical abstraction from the total situation or the historical antecedent of other moments is another question, upon which theologians are actively divided. But in either case, it seems clear that the ethical attack upon the doctrine of the universality of sin fails for two reasons, for it fails to appreciate difficulties on its own ground which beset the path of anyone who assumes that men can be compared in respect of absolute moral goodness, and it fails to understand the nature of the doctrine as a deliverance of faith.

N. H. G. Robinson.

Amsterdam 1948

Within the shadows of a crumbling world, strange patterns form.
Behind shut doors in Moscow, men play poker,
Biding the time to play the ace of bombs
If forced to call the bluff and double-bluff.
White hands, unnerved, to quick brown fingers pass the norm
Of scientific progress, no longer trusting it,
Except where high production still can charm
Producers to believe their own advertisements.
An iron curtain hides a stage on which the cast
Assembles clumsily, to play its first act—or its last.

Within the broken pattern lies design;
Within disorder, order may be heard;
The rose blooms in the desert as a sign.
Lord, be it to us according to Thy Word.

Yet,
The rose is cankered and the petals scattered,
Disorder reigns where order was decreed.
Design seems formless when the form is shattered,
Voices discordant which do not say one creed.

The presence is also a promise,
The promise already a command.

We know what we are, but not what we shall be,
Yet, when He comes, we shall be like Him
Who has already come and already commands.

The Good Shepherd speaks to the scattered sheep;
The Bridegroom pleads with the erring bride;
The sap of the Vine stirs in the withered branches.
When will you turn again, My people?
When will you turn again?

Is there a murmur of a mounting Kyrie?
It is evening.
Is this lifting of hands a sacrifice
Or only the votes of a democratic assembly?
You come from the ends of the earth.
Do you come to sit down at the feast of My kingdom
Or only at another conference-table?

In the shadows, strange patterns form.
In the valley of the shadows, I will fear no evil
If Thy rod guide us, if Thy staff strengthen us.
In the shadows, form Thy Church, for it is already formed;
In the valley, gather Thy flock, for they hear again Thy voice.
The bride hears Thy voice and waits.
Come. Have mercy.
Come.

T.

Tribute to Two Tractarians

In 1848 the Reverend William John Butler, as Vicar of Wantage, founded the Community of St Mary the Virgin there; in 1883, as Canon of Worcester, he founded in that city the High School for Girls, now called the Alice Ottley School. And now, in 1948, the year of C.S.M.V.'s Centenary, the Reverend Beresford James Kidd, D.D., Warden of C.S.M.V. from 1924 to 1945 and a Tractarian of like spirit with its Founder, has passed to his reward. We are bidden to praise famous men and our fathers that begat us; and one who was educated first at Butler's school at Worcester and then at Oxford under Dr Kidd has good reason to thank God for both these Christian men.

Dean Butler died at Lincoln in 1894; but Alice Ottley, whom he had chosen, trained, and left in charge at Worcester, ordered the school exactly on his lines till her retirement, just before her death, in 1912. Thus in the years 1899 to 1908 its régime was still essentially monastic, bearing the imprint of the Founder's previous experience with C.S.M.V. at every turn; and he himself still loomed over it as a living personality, so constantly was he recalled and quoted. "Religion—that which *binds*,"—that was the foundation; and it was

inculcated into us not only by direct religious teaching but by the whole ordering of our daily lives. Silence times and places were observed with a truly conventual precision; and this exactitude was matched by a terrific standard of obedience in everything we did. There were rules about everything, and a "Bad Mark" for almost every breach—for breaking silence, forgetting books or tools, untidy desk, even for a wrong correction; and at the weekly Mark Reading, when your name was called for a B.M., you had to stand up before the school and tell Miss Ottley what you got it for. Yet there were some, and they by no means prigs, who got a prize for No Bad Marks in the entire school year; and with even four such in a single term one nearly died of shame. Yet, strict and exacting as was this discipline, it never became galling or petty in its demands on us, because the whole system was rooted in the longing to serve God. Not that we children had that longing necessarily, but our Founder had had it, informing all he did; and our Head Mistress, who was so faithful to his spirit, had a quite extraordinary power of instilling principles even into quite unreligious little girls. So we learned to form our letters and our figures just as we were bidden, to rule pencil margins of a stated width, to keep our desks in order, and to produce our compasses, etc., when and where they were required for use, all as matters of obedience that we owed to God. "*O*-bedience, not *Ub*-bedience," she would say, making us repeat the word after her; we owed our whole selves to God, that was what *Duty* meant, and everything we had was given us by Him, to serve Him with. This basic principle of religious poverty was driven into us very forcibly in the matter of textbooks; for these were all school property, not ours, all carefully stitched into linen covers and lent to us just while we needed them; so woe betide you if a book was not in good condition when you gave it up! To lose or maltreat things provided for your use was tantamount to stealing (since nothing was your own); even to waste your blotting-paper by drawing pictures on it was dishonest, for your parents had paid for it for you to use, not spoil; and it was even worse to waste time or use words carelessly, for time was given you by God in precious trust to spend for Him, and the power of human speech was a wonderful and aweful thing that it was sacrilegious to abuse. In all these ways, besides learning by experience that it is really more fun to be orderly than not, once you get used to it, we had impressed upon us a tremendous sense of stewardship, which of course applied also to our faculties and gifts. We were not encouraged to want to be clever or to think we were, only to use and develop every scrap of capacity we had and to regard difficulties as chances, not as obstacles. It was a hard training, and many little noses were flattened on the grindstone of uncongenial subjects Miss Ottley would not suffer to be given up; but in the Sixth, where specializing was at last permitted, we profited enormously from those years of all-round grind, and it was a possession for life to have experienced thus early the possibility of overcoming inability and the satisfaction of getting over fences at long last. By and large, I think we got the bulk of our religious training in these ways, enforced and

backed by the school's daily prayers, that always set the note for a good day's work for God. "Prayer, Faith and Grind will do most things"—how often we heard that saying of our Founder's, and to my dying day my memory will echo Miss Ottley's versicle,

Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might,

and the school's ready answer,

That God in all things may be glorified!

The direct religious teaching that we had was immensely careful and given only by most devout believers—practising Catholics, most of them, though we did not know it, Miss Ottley herself taking the Sixth Form. We learned to love and reverence the Bible even to the point of never putting anything on top of it, a principle not always easy to pursue when it came to packing hats; and every Divinity lesson was begun with prayer. We acquired a loving but limited and quite uncritical familiarity with the Bible text—in nine years I never touched the writing prophets or any Epistle save Ephesians, which we did for Higher Certificate on Bishop Gore's then recent book; and we were taught a little English Church History together with a great love and reverence for the English Church. But we learned very little doctrine: I, at any rate, left at eighteen not only ignorant of the existence of the Sacrament of Penance, but with no clear grasp of any doctrine of the creed. This may seem a strange testimony to Dean Butler's school, but, apart from the possibility that more was taught than I took in, I think that he had known his Worcester, and had deliberately followed the Tractarian principle of "Reserve in Imparting Religious Knowledge" in ordering the teaching in his school. To have done otherwise, as things then were, would probably have wrecked it; as it was, it grew and prospered, serving a large country district as well as Worcester city and having a considerable number of boarders in independent houses; and all of us who were taught there, and especially those who were prepared for Confirmation, got a grounding in the Christian life—prayer, self-examination, Bible-reading, Church-going, Lent observance, and so forth—which could not be surpassed. After all, you cannot learn everything at once, and childhood is the time for learning principles and habits. A school that sent you out, as Butler's Worcester did, with *Candida rectaque*, its motto, as your standard, together with a deep sense of sinfulness and need and a conviction that the only thing in life that mattered was to find and follow your vocation, had done you good preparatory service, even though as yet you feared God only from afar; for He Himself would meet the need in His own time and light the fire of love.

And then, though not immediately, from training in Dean Butler's school to the direct influence of Dr Kidd! How terrifying the prospect was, for he was alarming in appearance in those days and had, moreover, the reputation (quite undeserved) of being a woman-hater. It made matters worse for me that for my initial interview he told me to call for him at the Bodleian, and thereafter walked me up and down in the adjacent Swine Market, trying to find out in

those august surroundings what, if anything, I knew. But the alarm soon disappeared, and his Church History lectures thrice and a private coaching with him once a week became the high-lights of one's student life. *The Times* obituary notice spoke of him as a painstaking teacher, but he was much more than merely that. His lectures, afterwards embodied in the three volumes of his *History of the Church to A.D. 461*, were enthralling; even with his rather dry delivery and total lack of any striving for effect they made those early centuries live before one's eyes. In them, as in his books, he used perfect English, simple and dignified as is St Leo's Latin, with never an unnecessary word nor one misused; and he lectured at an even pace, allowing one to take full notes (I have mine still) and yet enjoy what he was saying; he was always considerate, too, and ready to repeat a bit or spell an unfamiliar name. He gave full references to sources and expected us to look them up; we were not to be satisfied with taking facts at second-hand from him. How the giants of those days shone out—Origen, Hosius, Athanasius, Chrysostom—and how racy he was at times, though always fair, over the less reputable actors in the story, Paul of Samosata, that George the ex-pork butcher who was intruded into Athanasius' see, even St Jerome, "a saint for what he did rather than what he was." But those lectures conveyed far more than just the sheer delight in well-told human history, great though that was. They taught us living doctrine, linking the Bible with our present lives and bringing home the meaning and function of the Church with incomparable force. We could not ask questions in the lecture-room, but in coaching times his pupils could ask him anything they liked: however ignorant the question, he never made one feel a fool, and the occasional pungent colloquialism of his replies was unforgettable. Those coachings were indeed a humbling experience, not only because one had to read one's essays to him —and he never passed the smallest inexactitude—but because of the proximity of his own humility, putting his great learning and all-embracing vision so willingly at one's disposal, bearing so tenderly with immaturity. He had the most orderly mind that could possibly be imagined: every question was answered at once, right on the nail, with full instructions where to look the matter up; indeed, he used to say that knowing where to find things was the true test of education. He was never pedantic or merely academic: after expounding some point of doctrine in technical language he would say, "Now how would you teach that to children?" and he often related incidents of his own experience in the Sunday Catechism at St Paul's, with which, as indeed with all his work, he took infinite pains. Gentleness, simplicity, humility, devotion to the Church, a truly pastoral heart—those were his characteristics. He was deeply affectionate, too, under his matter-of-fact manner, and very faithful to old friends; wonderfully appreciative also of little things, grateful for the smallest service, and a most delightful person with whom to share a joke. He was a hidden saint in the true succession of Keble and Pusey and the first Tractarians, a worthy son also of his own great tutor, Dr Bright, of whom he loved to speak, one who asked

nothing of life except the privilege of serving God with everything he had; and when in his last years his powers failed, he bore the discipline of weakness with a patience that made one's heart sing for the triumph of it, for all that it was sad. His Requiem in Keble Chapel on May 18th, simple, tranquil, dignified, with all essentials and not a single frill, was exactly like him. Nothing could have been more fitting or more grateful to those he leaves behind.

A Religious of C.S.M.V.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Ven. G. F. Townley is Archdeacon of York.

The Rev. N. H. G. Robinson is Minister of the High Kirk of Rothesay, Isle of Bute.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE USE OF THE PSALTER

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Dr Oscar Hardman's plea for a revision of the Prayer Book Psalter (in Theology, February, 1948) merited something more than the oblique comments made by Bro. Every in the April issue. Dr Hardman wrote with admirable restraint: "It is one thing to listen to the reading of Old Testament lessons as inspired records of pre-Christian history, and quite another to recite or sing Old Testament songs instinct with pre-Christian hopes and aspirations as a mode of expressing Christian faith and worship" (p. 47). This vital distinction was constantly urged in the Convocation debates on the use of the Psalter during the period 1912-20, and what was said then by scholars like Dr Furneaux (Dean of Winchester) and Dr Chase (Bishop of Ely)[1] still holds good. In reciting the Psalter in public worship, we still come very near to making its words our words, its thoughts our thoughts, and no facile exploitation of the Hebrew notion of "corporate personality" or invocation of the "doctrine" of the Body of Christ should be allowed to mask our responsibility for the words we utter. Too often, those who plead for "objectivity" in public worship seem to assume that personal integrity ceases to count when we assemble and meet together and that sentiments which normally violate the Christian conscience are rendered innocuous by being identified "mystically" with the voice of Christ. Prebendary de Candole, in his recent article,[2] was at pains to point out that the Christian utters the psalmists' maledictions exclusively against "the

[1] *The Chronicle of Convocation*, (1912) pp. 98 f. and (1917) pp. 417 f.

[2] Theology, May, 1947.

unseen, spiritual, hosts of evil," but it is only a short step from his interpretation of the "I" of the psalms as "the corporate voice of God's people . . . the voice of the Eternal Christ"[1] to the position of a speaker in the Convocation of Canterbury, who defended the least Christian of the psalms with the statement that "the voice which spoke in the 58th psalm was the voice of Christ."[2] Similarly, the optimistic conviction of Fr Hebert that "there is little danger that the worshipper will take harm from the imprecatory psalms" is very closely bound up with his reliance on the theology of *Le Corps Mystique du Christ*.[3] It is obvious that there has been a profound change since 1917, when our leading churchmen struggled with what one of them called "the grave and difficult question of the use in church of the imprecatory passages in the Psalter."[4]

It is most important that we should appreciate that this change is essentially a *theological* one and that, therefore, it leaves the average worshipper very much where he was before—unless he, too, has been influenced generally by the decline in ordinary moral sensitiveness which our theological "advances" appear to reflect.

Of the many theological issues which the liturgical use of the Psalter raises, the doctrine of inspiration is at the present time perhaps the most crucial, because it has obvious repercussions on the larger debate which is now going on between those who defend the historical approach to Biblical revelation and those who advocate a return to some form of allegorical exegesis. A recent writer belonging to the latter group well illustrates a growing assumption which is usually either cautiously concealed or presented in a more sophisticated form. He explains how the Body of Christ has made the psalms "the vehicle of her devotions . . . expressing by her recitation of them those meanings of her own, which she obtained from her Catholic faith and not from the psalms, putting her own meaning upon their words rather than drawing it out of them . . . when we say that the Psalter, considered in relation to the Christian consummation, was inspired, we mean that it was so composed as to be capable of bearing new meanings . . . in the light of the Christian faith."[5] Now whatever the pros and cons of the larger debate, it is quite patent that such a view of inspiration, when applied to our use of the Psalter in church, reduces to complete insignificance all questions of text and translation and any "Order how the Psalter is appointed to be read" which has been or may be devised. Such considerations

[1] The view of some scholars that "I" is to be understood in a number of psalms in a corporate sense identifies the pronoun with ancient Israel and *not* with Christ or His Church.

[2] *Chronicle* (1912), p. 108. The same speaker returned to his defence five years later, when the following comment is recorded: "From the point of view of the humble worshippers in Christ's Holy Catholic Church it was the greatest mistake to trouble them about the historical character of the Psalms . . . He did not care a single atom what was in the mind of the writer of this Psalm. But put it into our Lord's mouth, and all were bound to join with Him in the denunciation," *Chronicle* (1917), p. 608.

[3] *The Authority of the Old Testament*, pp. 291 f. [4] *Chronicle* (1917), p. 408.

[5] G. D. Carleton, *The English Psalter* (Mowbrays, 1945), p. 19.

are significant only if we recognize that these particular Hebrew poems possess a certain measure of intrinsic spiritual authority which other canticles and hymns lack. If they are *merely* vehicles, the question of their interpretation hardly arises and every man is left to do that which is right in his own eyes.

It is ironical that our solicitude for an orderly method of reciting the psalms in the Church of England should have now hardened out into a tradition which upholds the belief in their intrinsic spiritual authority in theory, while undermining it in practice. In fact, it even comes near to foreclosing the free debate on hermeneutical principles by imposing the allegorical method on the whole Church.

In the article to which I have already referred, Preb. de Candole rightly pointed out that the ordering of Psalm 19 for Christmas Day may be taken to imply an official canonizing of the allegorical approach. He might, indeed, have gone on to show that the ordering of every psalm which is meaningless without some detailed exposition (because of mistranslation, obscure proper names, forgotten historical allusions, verses which exclude the future life, sacrificial references, maledictions, etc.) means *in practice* a choice between allegorizing and singing unintelligible nonsense little short of blasphemy. I do not believe that this choice adequately represents our tradition of intellectual and spiritual integrity.

Further delay in taking the necessary measures for a thoroughgoing reform of our practice of using the *whole* Psalter will simply play into the hands of those who are prepared to find their freedom in allegorizing (by which anything can be made to mean anything) and to exploit our bondage for the strengthening of a type of churchmanship which is Catholic in principle and congregationalist in practice. Dr Darwell Stone was remarkably prophetic in his warning that "the Church is not likely to be able to retain . . . the recitation of the psalter in public worship unless the use of mystical interpretation is to some extent recognized."[1] Our present retention of *all* the psalms inevitably drives us to adopt some sort of "mystical interpretation"; it is therefore high time that loyal Anglicans, who cannot accept so ill-disciplined a makeshift, were given the option of avoiding those psalms which in practice demand it.

This was the view of Bishop Frere, whom nobody could accuse of being ignorant of liturgical tradition or indifferent to the Catholic heritage of the Church of England. It is regrettable that the *Liturgical Psalter*, in which he gave practical expression to his convictions, should be out of print.[2] The germ of this work will be found in a motion which he proposed in the Lower House of York Convocation in 1917: "That with a view to amending the public recitation of the Psalms at Morning and Evening Prayer this House would welcome the preparation of a Liturgical Psalter containing the parts of the Psalms which are most suitable for this purpose. . . ."[3] He pointed out in the debate that because of their greater freedom the Noncon-

[1] *The New Commentary*, vol. i, p. 695.
[2] W. H. Frere, *A Liturgical Psalter* (Mowbrays, 1925).
[3] *The York Journal of Convocation* (1917), pp. 177 ff.

formists had been able to maintain ancient liturgical practice by including in their hymn books large *selections* from the Psalter—"an example which the Church might very well follow." In the introduction to his own selection in the *Liturgical Psalter*, he explained that his aim was "to put in the mouths of, say, a Sunday-evening's congregation such passages only as it could find edifying and real. The impelling motive has been a strong sense that the present practice leads to a great deal of unreality and consequent indevotion. This would probably not be the case with those who are accustomed to a constant recitation of the whole Psalter in course. They may have acquired sufficient skill in mystical interpretation, or sufficient historical perspective, to turn the whole Psalter to spiritual profit. But this capacity is not to be expected of the main bulk of Sunday worshippers; and it is they, and their needs, that are here chiefly taken into consideration."

Whatever the outcome of the theological debate on hermeneutical principles (and it will be observed that Frere did not exclude allegorical interpretation), the pastoral problem which the Bishop saw and faced so boldly in 1925 is still very much with us. Dr Hardman can legitimately echo his words in 1948: "Again and again there is a realized gap . . . which few are capable of bridging by the methods of Messianic, corporate, and mystical interpretation."[1] In view of the overwhelmingly large body of evidence that something must be done, it is difficult to understand why a motion "That some experimental variations in the Psalter should be permitted and encouraged," proposed by the Dean of Durham and seconded by the Bishop of Jarrow in the Convocation of York as recently as October, 1944,[2] is still (apparently) awaiting a practical response. Action is urgently needed, and it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that Bishop Frere's *Liturgical Psalter* affords a very suitable starting-point.[3] There is an ever-increasing mass of material to help us. The extremely illuminating reports contained in *The Chronicle of Convocation* and *The York Journal of Convocation* for the period 1912-20 can now be read in perspective—and it would be folly to ignore them; the final revision of Bishop Jane's translation (accepted in theory by the English Church in 1920!)[4] has been well tested in practice by the Irish Church; the B.B.C., we are told,[5] have in preparation a new edition of the seventy best psalms; and we have before us works such as *The Psalms*,[6] by Canon N. Dalton, and *The Prayer Book Psalter*

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 47. A similar comment made in 1917 by Dr Barker, Dean of Carlisle, is worth recording: "He was sure choir boys did not see the mystical meanings in the imprecatory clauses of the Psalms, nor were they likely to treat them purely as a matter of history . . . ordinary congregations were not equal to, and ought not to be called upon to, perform such feats of spiritual gymnastics," *The York Journal* (1917), pp. 173 f.

[2] *The York Journal* (October, 1944), pp. 80 ff.

[3] It was astonishing to discover that an independent selection of psalms made recently for an undergraduate congregation coincided almost exactly with that made by Frere for the use of the Church nearly twenty-five years ago.

[4] See Canterbury Report No. 527 and York Report No. 338.

[5] *York Journal*, May, 1945, p. 19.

[6] Cambridge (1931).

Revised,[1] by Dr G. A. Cooke, as well as many smaller private productions like *A New Church Psalter*,[2] designed for the use of Marlborough College.

If only the parochial clergy could be granted *immediately* complete freedom to experiment with selections corresponding to their own special needs,[3] it would be possible not only to correct without further delay the disturbing theological and pastoral consequences of nearly forty years' dilly-dallying, but also, *before long*, to add to our wealth of scholarly material a wealth of pastoral experience which would be no less necessary for the guidance of a full-dress commission.

Dr Hardman modestly suggested that "the time is ripe for the Church to make a thorough revision of Coverdale's work, adapting it to liturgical use by correcting errors, removing obscurities and maledictions. . . ." The time is indeed over-ripe and the fruit of the Psalter has started to rot.

E. W. Heaton.

Gonville and Caius College,
Cambridge.

THE CHURCH AND THE ATOM

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

It is a generous editor who permits a reply to a reply, and I must strive to emulate Dr Robinson's brevity in his letter in your October issue.

(1) I saw no particular reason to "counter" Archdeacon Hartill's quotation from Professor Tawney; no doubt it contains an important element of truth and a valuable warning. I do not, however, believe that the doctrines of either the Just War or the Just Price have ceased to have application to the contemporary situation, though I find it entirely natural that opinion in a post-Christian society should regard them in this light (on the Just Price, see the volume of essays published under this title by the S.C.M. Press in 1930, edited by V. A. Demant).

(2) To assess the "honesty and realism" of the authors of the Report by its reception in the "secular weeklies" involves assumptions as to their standards of judgment which do not seem to me self-evident. I notice, however, that a reviewer in the current (October 7th) number of the *New English Weekly*, who is not a

[1] Oxford (1939). [2] Oxford (1936).

[3] The fears expressed in the Convocation debates that the incumbent would abuse his freedom to select unless it were made conditional upon permission granted by the Ordinary make strange reading. As the Bishop of Exeter remarked: "He did not see that anything very disastrous had happened because the clergy had been allowed liberty in the choice of their hymns" (*Chronicle* (1917), p. 413). It is sufficiently obvious that the hymns in present-day popular services to a large extent determine the theology of the congregation, and that unless the choice of them is also controlled nothing is achieved by preventing the clergy from selecting their own psalms.

member of the Church of England, describes the Report as "a remarkably careful and able discussion of morality in warfare, from both the historical and theological standpoints," and considers that in it Anglicanism "has found a worthy voice to say what needs to be said at this juncture."

(3) I am sorry if I have misquoted Dr Robinson in the matter of reference to our Lord's teaching in the Report, but I cannot feel that in so far as I may have done so I have been nearly as misleading as the statement in his original letter must have been to anyone who had not seen the Report. I can only repeat that the preceding section on "The Biblical Interpretation of History" is subsumed in the section on "Morality in Warfare" which immediately follows it.

(4) Dr Robinson summarized the important paragraph on p. 52 thus:

> "Atomic warfare breaks all the rules, but by the omniscient 'doctrine of necessity' can be blessed for use in *any* way most efficacious in *any* state of 'present imminent danger.' " (My italics.)

In stigmatizing this summary as a "monstrous distortion" I still consider myself to be justified. The Report most carefully specifies the particular form of (undeniable) imminent danger which its authors had in mind—when "one nation began hostilities against another by launching an attack with atomic weapons upon its principal cities." The justification for threatening reprisals in such a case arises from the obligation, previously asserted in the Report, that every government has to protect the community of which it has charge from extinction. Whether this justification is valid is doubtless a grave question for Christians, but to describe the Commission's discussion of this difficult matter as "casuistry" justifying "naked expediency," and to dismiss it as "hypocrisy," is, in my view, all that I have said that it is.

Dr Robinson declares that war "in itself cannot be an act of justice." But the punishment of murderers and criminals is in fact commonly so described. Because I believe in what Dr Robinson regards as the outmoded doctrine of the Just War, I consider that a conflict which Christians are justified in supporting can only be one in which restraint of the aggressor is in fact an act of justice.

Yours sincerely,

MAURICE B. RECKITT.

"A NEW TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

At the outset of the article on "A New Translation of the Bible" in your August issue of this year (p. 303) it is said that "The initiative in the plan for a new translation probably came from justifiable commercial enterprise on the part of the University Presses." I write on behalf of the Joint Committee for the new trans-

lation to say that this conjecture has no foundation in fact. The initiative came from the Church of Scotland.

Yours faithfully,

ALWYN DUNELM.

AUCKLAND CASTLE,
BISHOP AUCKLAND.
October 11th, 1948.

"THE EVANGELICALS AND THE MINISTRY"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

It was a shrewd hit that Prof. Ramsey had last month at his fellow professor, and the points made about Justification and Grace were wise and good. But that which was said concerning Bishop Neill and in (3) on non-"catholist" ministries is not so happy—indeed, is not happy at all. He does not appreciate Bishop Neill's remarkable and admirable essay. He nowhere betrays the slightest nervousness that the catholists are in any way wrong, in need of the evangelicals' protesting on the subject of the Ministry. Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome have erred in the faith, says Article XIX. Perhaps, then, the manner in which they have thought of the Ministry has not been perfect. Perhaps Bishop Neill is to be blessed, not groaned at, for raising the question whether catholist exclusiveness is not based on wrong ideas of God. Are we not all sub-Christian in much of our thought? Do we not need to be challenged and to bless the challengers? Prof. Ramsey does not dissociate himself from the shaliach-racket of most of the authors of *The Apostolic Ministry*. Dom Gregory Dix (October THEOLOGY, p. 386) still clings, I take it, to Christ being bound willy-nilly to the acts of His plenipotentiaries. Here is deep fundamental cleavage on the character of the Lord's lordship in the Church. Christ is held bound to the Ordinals of the traditionalists, instead of these being fine great channels of Christ's ordaining activity, which is not, however, confined to them.

There is an account of an unusual ordination in *Three Byzantine Saints*, by E. Dawes and N. H. Baynes (Blackwell, Oxford, 1948). The book consists of an Englishing of the Greek lives of three east-Romans, the first of whom is Daniel the stylite, A.D. 409-491. The Archbishop of Constantinople, at the order of the Emperor, went out to the pillar to ordain the hermit cresting it. Daniel refused compliance. Towards the end of a day at the foot of the column of the obstinate stylite the archdeacon prayed, and then the archbishop "himself stood and uttered a further prayer, and through the prayer ordained the holy man to be a priest, and said, 'Bless us, sir priest; from henceforth you are a priest by the grace of Christ; for when I had prayed God laid his hand upon you from above.' And for a long time the crowd shouted, 'Worthy is he.' Afterwards all, together with the archbishop, besought the holy man, saying, 'Order the ladder to be put in position, seeing that you have now become what you wished to avoid.' On the just man's giving permission for

this to be done, the archbishop mounted the ladder, holding in his hand the chalice of the Holy Body and the Precious Blood of our good Mediator Jesus Christ our God. After saluting each other with a holy kiss, they received the communion at each other's hands. Then the archbishop descended from the hill, and entering the palace reported all that had happened to the Emperor" (p. 32). How disturbing this is to the people who today think they are Christ's Church, the catholic orthodox persons, can be seen from the comment in Butler's *Lives of the Saints* (1938, new edition, by H. Thurston and D. Attwater), December 11th: "Without descending from it he was ordained priest by St Gennadius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who, having read the preparatory prayers at the bottom of the pillar, went to the top of it presumably to impose his hands on Daniel, though this is not stated. Apparently Daniel did not want to be ordained, and accordingly refused to come down." A pretty presumption. But the reformed folk may claim that at their prayer the divine hand itself does what is claimed for it by this disciple of the blessed Daniel.

Some people owe to the *Daily Worker* the breaking of the spell that Communism had cast on them. Without wishing to suggest that Dr Kirk's essay in *The Apostolic Ministry* is propaganda of the calibre of that to be found in the *Daily Worker*, yet I confess that I owe to Dr Kirk release from the grip of catholist theory in my understanding of the Ministry. If the evangelical essayists have not fully faced up to Dr Kirk, perhaps Bishop Newbigin (*The Reunion of the Church*, p. 158) has. In writing about the evangelicals and the Ministry, would that Prof. Ramsey had met the onslaught of Dr T. W. Manson (*The Church's Ministry*) and of Bishop Newbigin, and dealt with this type of approach to the problem at the top of its form. The authors of *The Apostolic Ministry* are quite clear non-episcopal ministries are not the same thing as the "Catholic" Ministry. This is what I would query. The undoubted differences may be more peripheral, less essential, than the catholists think. Has not Christ called to share in his Messianic Ministry many of those who are called ministers by the Methodists, say, and the Lutherans, and Presbyterians? Have they not offered themselves, been offered, amidst the people through Christ for the work of the Ministry? Who knows whether Christ has not accepted and graced the oblation? Is it not a matter to be examined, looked into? Have we not all to clarify the intentions of our Ordinals? To offer Christ for the living and the dead, does not this belong to the intention of Christian initiation rather than that of the pastorate? Of course, all whom Christ so calls should be in union with one another, must strive to win and maintain mutual recognition of the will of Christ for them. When they are of sufficient oneness of mind in the faith (and here lie the strongholds of our divisions), does not the historic episcopate properly outwardly express it? "The historic episcopate is accepted as that which has been and may be again the organ and expression of the Church's unity, its unity through time with all who have gone before and through space with all everywhere who call Christ

Lord. But the return to it must be in such wise that the true nature of the Church's union, a union in Christ and in the Father through the Spirit, is not obscured. Of this union a continuous historical order and a ministry carrying the unbroken authority of the whole Church are the proper expression, but they are not the guarantee" (Newbigin, p. 109).

Prof. Ramsey suggests that the use of the non-episcopal ministries compared to that of the episcopal is as reading by Braille to reading by eyesight. This may be so, it may not be so. The body-metaphor does not settle it. Bodies can't sprout new eyes, but in the Church pastors are added to the pastorate. Prof. Ramsey believes these new pastors can spring forth only from beneath the hands of the present bishops, but the truth may be that it happens sometimes in the Church, still infected with the *is not* of sin, without the help of mortal bishops. When the Father, through the Son, ordains in the Church and joins to the Christ in his ministerial apostolate someone new, the co-operation of all in the Church is called for and involved —Christ the Head, the faithful departed, bishops, presbyters, and Christian initiates on earth. People sometimes speak of the "Church" when they mean the faithful minus the ministers (see B. L. Manning in T. W. Manson's *The Church's Ministry*, pp. 89-92). That is woeful. The bishops and presbyters should have a very high part in the acceptance from Christ of a new apostolic, in the grace-giving welcoming of him into their orders. But is Christ bound to them? Is it so high as quite to justify William Temple's "When I consecrate . . ."? Is the Christ unable or unwilling to bestow new apostolics when the bishops in a particular historic situation refuse their compliance?

Here is indeed a debate to be continued, pressed on into, in which we have much to learn from each other, that something more of the wholeness of the truth may get hold of us.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT P. SYMONDS.

SCHOLÆ CANCELLARII
LINCOLNIENSIS.

ON REVIEWS OF AMERICAN BOOKS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I should like to offer you an impression of the manner in which American works of theology are customarily interpreted by book reviewers in your otherwise superlative magazine. Viz:

THE DOCTRINAL ASPECTS OF DOCTRINE. By J. Wilbur Woe. A.B.C. Press. 14s.

There is a faint penumbra of literacy to be discerned by a patient and sympathetic observer who looks beyond the hulking shadow of American theology. While we must not relax our grasp on the central fact of Christian witness in our time, namely that it is a

specifically Anglo-Saxon witness, the natural and instinctive modesty of the Establishment, together with its blessed receptivity to all modes of thought from Zen Buddhism to Christian Science, requires of us a certain tolerance with respect to the sincere if somewhat primitive vapourings of our American cousins, more especially those of the "Episcopalian" persuasion.

Dr Woe's rather daring excursion into what he calls "the doctrinal aspects of doctrine" gives evidence of some rude learning at approximately the level of the Third Programme. (Incidentally, Dr Woe carelessly renders it "Program.") To be sure, there are the usual gaucheries, quite inseparable from American "theology." On p. 22 we encounter a startling accident in the form of a split infinitive, and in the Appendix a participle is allowed most damnably to dangle. The A.V. is consistently, mayhap wilfully, referred to as "the King James Version." With regard to recent psychiatric studies of St Paul (Larimer's *Could It Be?* London, 1843; *et al.*) Dr Woe betrays the characteristically abject, not to say craven, fear of homosexuality which dominates the American mind, and is no doubt largely responsible for that prevalent American neurosis of a "vigorous" Christianity (charity restrains us from enclosing "Christianity" in quotation marks also). Yet if we read carefully, picking our way through the abominable jungle that is the American syntax, we descry an occasional dim gleam, or glimmer, of "intelligence"—a word which, in U.S. usage, has a very different connotation from that which obtains, if we may say so, in the United Kingdom. The weary traveller may, *e.g.*, pause gratefully over such an illuminating fragment as "Dom Gregory Dix bespeaks not the doctrine of the Church but the doctrine of Dom Gregory Dix." So happy an inadvertence, however, is rare.

May it not be time to investigate a curious feature of American theological "thinking"?—to wit, that all third- and fourth-rate American theologians brandish three names (John Roger Jones, William Makepiece Smith, or—in truncated forms—W. Somerset Milwink, D. Vernon Ven, etc.). Only the pathetic handful of second-rate theologians in the U.S. are content with two names: and only the *pukka* English reticence denies us the melancholy privilege of pointing out that there are no first-rate American theologians.

A few other matters deserve passing reference in this exceedingly long (772 pp.) and frightfully dull volume, said to be the lifework of a "rector" of an "Episcopal" parish in the city of Michigan. *Shaliach* does not appear in the Index, nor for that matter even in the text. The word "favour" is thrice misspelt "favor" (p. 101, p. 261, p. 543). On p. 90 a careless proofreader—or possibly our Yankee divine?—has allowed the possessive *His* in relation to God to be printed with a small *h*: but this may be only a subtle corrosion induced by "Continental" theology, which appears to be making a more considerable stir in American "Episcopalianism" than has even the almost total absence of anything that might be called modern Anglican theology. (For such men as Canon Richardson and Dr D. M. Baillie on our own green isles can scarcely hope to retain an Anglican identifica-

tion in books which freely quote Dr Niebuhr and the *Westminster Shorter Catechism*.) Irritating American locutions abound, and have the effect of distracting the reader from a proper mood of Christian forbearance. There is the rather absurd suggestion (p. 485) that some U.S. bishops are more anti-episcopate than English bishops, and have "a yen [*sic*] to lose themselves in the warm if muddy [*sic*] waters of organic union." The mixed metaphor itself is enough to stun an English reader, who is furthermore appalled at the American suggestion that there are U.S. prelates worthy of rank alongside British prelates in the struggle to cleanse Anglicanism of any recognizable Anglican traits, uses, and formularies.

Beyond these mild and random comments, this reviewer is constrained to acknowledge that he has but the vaguest notion of what, precisely, Dr Woe's book is about.

EDWARD TANTRUM.

Having taken my exercise of fantasy this far, I should want to round it off with a little verse written some years ago by E. B. White, the gifted editorialist of *The New Yorker*. It applies to drama reviewers—but not (as Gertrude Stein might have said) necessarily.

The critic leaves at curtain-fal
To find, in starting to review it,
He scarcely saw the play at all
For watching his reactions to it.

Sincerely yours,
MAYNARD KNISKERN.

355, EAST HIGH STREET,
SPRINGFIELD 11, OHIO.
September 18th, 1948.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE APPROACH TO METAPHYSICS. By E. W. F. Tomlin. Kegan Paul. 12s. 6d.

This book is "an essay in philosophical tendencies designed to throw light on our present perplexities" (p. x). Its broad contention is that metaphysics is a background pattern presupposed by civilization. A particular civilization, that is, has metaphysical presuppositions, and metaphysics is concerned with these presuppositions not only analytically in their formulation, but more constructively with their historical development, and presumably predictively in regard of future possibilities. In general, then, the quality of a civilization and its metaphysical presuppositions are close correlates, so that the study of metaphysics cannot be irrelevant to the problems and perplexities which beset modern civilization.

This is the view of metaphysics developed in the book, and it is approached along three directions:

(*a*) *Through the theory of perception.* Here there seem to be broadly two conclusions, neither of which, however, is expressed very precisely, nor made clearly relevant to the book's main purpose: (i) "The knowledge that we gain in perception, being 'practical,' is

less than the highest kind of knowledge that we can conceive" (p. 81). The highest kind of knowledge—metaphysics—will therefore be concerned presumably with the *presuppositions* of the problem. (ii) Perception demands "activity," and so the theory of perception is never to be isolated from the study of that complete activity which is social behaviour in the widest sense.

(*b*) *By a discussion of the concept of metaphysics itself.* Here the theme that metaphysics is the pattern of civilization is illustrated by a survey of the emergence of European civilization, with special reference to the formative influence of Plato, Aristotle, and the Christian Fathers.

(*c*) *By a survey of the metaphysical background to modern thought.* The development of modern thought is portrayed very skilfully in a panorama which extends from Descartes to Hegel.

A final section describes the contemporary situation in philosophy, as being that "thought-background" with which this approach to metaphysics will be immediately concerned, if it endeavours to be usefully relevant to our present perplexities. Positivism of all varieties from Comte to A. J. Ayer come in for mention, as well as Bergson, Alexander, and Whitehead.

I will now make some brief comments on each of the four sections of the book:

I. While there are some minor defects in this section,[1] the general point made is important: that perception demands *activity*, and that "realism" has for too long regarded perception as passive, with sense-data as somehow atomic actors which pass on and off a world stage for the objective viewing of passive percipients.

But with this insight into perception as active in character, goes the view that perceptual knowledge is less than the highest knowledge, which the author still regards Platonically as knowledge of the unchanging (p. 81).

Now here a fundamental difficulty is raised: is this "highest knowledge" to be knowledge of "ultimate reality" or of presuppositions?

Throughout the book no distinction is made between these two concepts of philosophy. On p. 6 philosophy "is the study of *ultimate* reality—of 'what really is,'" but in Part II philosophy is concerned with the presuppositions of civilization (see, *e.g.*, p. 104). Yet these are not obviously identical views of philosophy—the former could hope for quasi-scientific philosophies which discoursed of "realities" and their subsistence, indeed of the whole menagerie of metaphysical monsters which many, with Russell, would wish to see abolished.

The latter viewpoint, on the other hand, might make philosophy only a matter of "regulative" symbols whose connexion with "reality" was problematical. Probably the major question of modern philosophy is how to arrange for the banishment of the quasi-scien-

[1] *E.g.*, is it true that Berkeley denied that the real world exists independently of our perception of it? (p. 47). What, if so, of Berkeley's God? Again, some may shrink a little at the mention of "the unlimited capacity of human thought" (p. 55)—and not merely from obsessions with original sin.

tific monsters without making philosophy altogether verbal; in brief, how to formulate a concept of philosophy to do justice to each of the two differing views which the writer apparently regards as synonymous.

It is no defect in a book for the ordinary reader that technical problems of great difficulty are not discussed; but is not this problem so fundamental to the main contention of the book, that not to discuss it is largely to vitiate the whole purpose of writing it?

II. My main criticism of this second section is that the Christian background is very much oversimplified, though for the book's main purpose, and for the general reader, some of the inadequacies may be unavoidable. But how far is Logos theology worthy of an unqualified Christian admiration? Again, does the writer's account of the Christian faith do justice to the contribution of Hebrew religion? The Christian faith is not assent to a Logos Christology—it is surely a gospel—good news about God, and about God's act in History.

While Christological doctrine had, in its emergence, and has had since in its exposition, a tremendous influence on civilization, I am not sure that the influence of the Christian faith has not been greater by reason of those of its tenets which, while less easily adapted to philosophical language, are no less equally challenging in their claims.

The author might readily admit that other Christian metaphysical presuppositions could be analysed out from the pattern of civilization—though admittedly with greater difficulty because less explicit. But here, I fear, we have raised again the problem of Section I. For Logos theology is essentially quasi-scientific—philosophy in the grand manner—whereas doctrines of the Remnant, "grace," and so on are Christian ideas or presuppositions, not primarily metaphysical in their formulation, but rather awaiting the language of a philosophical synthesis. Nor is Logos theology very satisfactory for such a synthesis.

III. This is undoubtedly the best section of the book, though there are some curious omissions, such as all reference to Kant's *Critique of Judgment*. But we can, for example, admire the metaphor of the mirage as typifying metaphysical enquiry (p. 201), and we can usefully ponder the claim that there is "no faith without ritual" (p. 212) —ritual being expressive of background presuppositions.

IV. This section comes a close second to Section III for interest and quality. There is a useful mention of Logical positivists (though it would have been even more useful to remind the reader of the tremendous differences between the various people who might qualify for the description); and the writer is very brave (and to be commended) for attempting summaries of Alexander and Whitehead.

There is a wise comment in the conclusion that "the family is the cradle of values; . . . family education, is . . . religious education" (p. 267), but there is a curious remark on pp. 268-9 that seems to suggest a caste of intellectuals. I am a little perplexed as to what will be the relation between the dons and the good families.

This is undoubtedly a book for the ordinary reader, nor is it guilty of "writing down," and it shows a thoughtful concern for our present perplexities. I would nearly recommend reading it in the reverse direction were the book not so much of a unity as to make that not over easy. For Parts I and II have that convinced and learned elusiveness that at times characterized Collingwood. But Collingwood made many converts, and the book may do the same.

It is significant that the author acknowledges, indeed, his greatest debt to Collingwood, Whitehead, and A. E. Taylor, and the influence of Collingwood is obvious, both as a general inspiration and in the historical interest and detail that the book sets forth.

In the writer's attitude to a speculative metaphysics and in other ways, too, Whitehead's influence is very clear. We are warned that there will be no explicit reference to A. E. Taylor, but I should judge that the greatest influence has been in Taylor's preaching of a close and necessary connexion between thought and behaviour, metaphysics and practical life.

Altogether the book is one of learning and conviction, and is written with the desire so to re-unite philosophy and life as to give Civilization a metaphysics which will enable her to avoid disaster.

How far this general contention is either plausible or specifically Christian I leave for others to speculate. But before doing so, it would be no waste of time—indeed, they might well do best—first to read this book.

I. T. Ramsey.

Christ's College,
Cambridge.

Lectures on Godmanhood. By Vladimir Solovyev, with an Introduction by P. Peter Zouboff. Denis Dobson. 18s.

Russia and the Universal Church. By Vladimir Solovyev, translated by Herbert Rees. Geoffrey Bles. 15s.

Dostoevsky. By L. A. Zander. S.C.M. Press. 10s.

The Russian philosopher Vladimir Solovyev (1853-1900) is so far known to English readers chiefly through his small book on *The Meaning of Love* and a long biographical essay in Dr Zernov's *Three Russian Prophets*. He is important not only as a source for the religious philosophy of Berdyaev and the sophiology of Fr Sergius Boulgakov. His passion for universals in the medieval sense of the term that led him to see the unity of the created world revealed in the reading-room of the British Museum and in the Egyptian sky drove him on to consider the unity of man in the old and in the new Adam, the universality of the Christian revelation, and the broken unity of Christendom. *Russia and the Universal Church*, abridged into French from Russian originals, and published in France in 1889, reflects his revolt against the proud provincialism of the Slavophils. His indifference to the particular historical fact led him at this moment in his life to accept, root and branch, the French Roman Catholic version of Byzantine history, without realizing the

Slavophil origins of his own contemptuous attitude towards the Greeks. He unloaded his disgust for the Russian state upon the Byzantine empire, ignoring the German origins of the system of Church-government established by Peter the Great. But the last section of the book, "on the Trinitary principle and its social application," is in line with the *Lectures on Godmanhood* delivered in 1878. These reveal the deep chasm between his thinking and the general line of Western theological development.

Solovyev's conception of the relationship between the three hypostases in the Trinity, between the creator and the created universe, is mythical rather than metaphysical. His dialectic is only superficially Hegelian, and owes more to the responses in the Orthodox liturgy. His Sophia is not so much a world-soul as a fusion already accomplished in the Russian mind between what Professor Zander, in his book on Dostoevsky, calls "the great mother damp earth" and Byzantine ikons of the Blessed Virgin Mary. She is a poetic figure of the created universe, mankind, the humanity of Christ, the Virgin, the mystical Church. The *Lectures on Godmanhood* are an early work; their place in his development is ably explained in Dr Zouboff's introduction. *Russia and the Universal Church* seems to me less important. Most of it reflects a temporary hope of reunion through some kind of political reconciliation between the Pope and the Tsar. Solovyev's maturest thinking is, however, available in English in Mrs Duddington's translation of *The Justification of the Good*, published by Constable in 1918. *War, Progress, and the End of History* is also important for *A Story of Anti-Christ* at the end. By the time when these books were written, at the end of his life, Solovyev had come to realize that harmony between the Church and the Christian state could not be achieved until society had been more radically dechristianized. The theological differences that made his reconciliation with Rome ineffectual and drove him back to Eastern Orthodoxy on his death-bed remove him further from Protestantism than from Roman Catholicism, nor can we disregard the fact that his own Church had been consistently cool towards his idea of Sophia. But some of these difficulties have been due to theological judgments on a poet and a religious philosopher, who should be compared, not to Western theologians, but to such figures as Dante, Sir Thomas Browne, Coleridge, Kierkegaard, and Charles Williams. His influence on the West is felt where St Thomas and Kierkegaard meet, and St Gregory of Nyssa is read again. His influence in Russia may be important in the future.

It is significant that in Russia today the reaction from official godlessness in the direction of some kind of religious neutrality does not seem to lead towards "a free Church in a free State" (an idea unknown to Russian history), but to a new kind of official relationship between the State and the Church. The future of this is hard to interpret, but it might conceivably develop on lines that Solovyev envisaged—into a State that had deliberately renounced its concern with theory to concentrate on practical necessities. One thing is certain, that the Russian Church remains deeply distrustful of the

Western Christian preoccupation with questions that suggest a desire for political influence or power. This distrust seems to me more deeply rooted than historical objections to Papal jurisdiction or theological misdoubtings of Western doctrine. Solovyev has been called the Russian Newman. One of the most important things about him is his failure to become a Roman Catholic.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

KELHAM.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE. Illustrated edition, revised and enlarged. By Cecil Roth. East and West Library. 25s.

JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY. By James Parkes. Gollancz. 10s. 6d.

To have covered 4,000 years of history in 400 eminently readable pages is no mean feat, but despite the attractive illustrations, Mr Roth's book makes bitter reading for Christians. Jewish history during the past 2,000 years has been largely a history of persecution in the name of Christ, ranging from repression and restriction to murder and expulsion, the blasphemous farce of conversionist sermons and enforced baptism and bullying that would discredit dirty-minded schoolboys. It is almost unbelievable that against this background such tremendous scholarship should have flourished, at nearly all periods, on which Christian scholars, including the schoolmen, drew extensively without being aware of its origin. Mr Roth also shows, though this is not his intention, that Christians owe a debt of gratitude to pre-New Testament Jews for their struggle to preserve monotheism and all that this implies. The Maccabees were a dissident and extremist group if ever there was one. In their fight for the Jewish religion and way of life against the polytheistic Hellenism of Antiochus Epiphanes, they were not squeamish, and today would certainly have called forth archiepiscopal denunciations; but there is food for thought in the reflection that had they failed, the Incarnation, humanly speaking, could not have taken place. For, as Dr Parkes points out, "from the very beginning Calvary presupposes Sinai. The life of Jesus could not have been spent, nor the teaching of Jesus given, in any other environment than that of the Jewish community. The Jewish Society and Jewish values are presupposed in everything He said or did . . . assumed so naturally that no open reference to them is necessary."

Dr Parkes's thesis is that the conflict between the Church and the Synagogue has been a tragic mistake. In Archbishop Temple's words: "The separation of Christianity from Judaism was a schism, which, like all schism, left truth divided." Not only, says Dr Parkes, is Judaism completed in Christianity, Christianity is incomplete without Judaism. In a chapter on St Paul he produces cogent reasons for believing that he never abandoned Judaism.

Many people will disagree violently with Dr Parkes, but it is hard to answer his question: "How, if the theological attitude of the

Church to the Synagogue be that which conforms to the Will of God, can the other side be true—the deep stain of blood, the wall of intolerable lies, which stands between the people of the two faiths through the actions of men who professed themselves Christians?"

Both books are stimulating and would be enjoyable were it not that both are constant reminders of our unrepented sins, who, throughout the ages, have spat in the faces of our Lord and His Mother.

HELENA CHARLES.
LONDON.

THE CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS. By P. T. Forsyth. Independent Press. 2nd edition. 10s. 6d.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION. By F. R. M. Hitchcock. Church Book Room Press. 6s.

The republication of Forsyth's works is an event of considerable importance, and it is to be hoped that Anglicans will take the opportunity of studying carefully the thought of a profound and original theologian who wrote "from the Free Church camp, but not from any recognized Free Church position" (p. xv). They will learn much from him, not least when they are driven to reconsider their reasons for disagreeing with him.

It is difficult to review a book which is thirty years old, and hardly necessary to review one which is already provided with a judicious preface from such a writer as Dr J. K. Mozley. The book ranges far and wide, and perhaps the reviewer may be excused if he chooses for comment Forsyth's views on one subject of especial interest at the moment—*viz.*, Church Unity and the Ministry—and the relation to these of the now increasingly discussed Anglican Tradition.

"If it [Anglicanism] could, in any practicable time, discard as essential the Prelate, the Prince, and the Priest—the modern Episcopate, which its own scholars now remove from the New Testament; the Establishment, which a growing number, even in the Episcopate, would discard; and the sacrificing priesthood, which a vast number of its ministering priesthood would also renounce—then it would have a certain chance of gathering the other Churches round its historic hegemony, its venerable tradition, and its spiritual splendour, so long as no question of prerogative was raised" (p. 108). This is not one of Forsyth's happiest ideas; and the passage is already dated. But it is revealing, and has its relevance for modern proposals of mutual recognition of orders. ("It costs us as much to admit Catholic ideas as it costs them to admit ours.") And is the function of Anglicanism to provide an ecclesiastical museum in which reunited Protestants can admire the harmless relics of antiquity? Not thus do we conceive of our mediating vocation in divided Christendom.

Forsyth maintains with vehemence that the ministry is not merely convenient but necessary. "In one sense it is created by the Church, but in a far greater sense it creates it. . . . The ministry is a prophetic

and sacramental office" (pp. 132, 133). The ministry not only expresses and maintains the unity of the Church, but creates it. Here is high doctrine. But he makes it clear that for him the main function of the ministry is to proclaim the saving word, and that its connexion with the original Apostolate is one of community of doctrine only (vouched for by its obedience to the New Testament). The test of its "validity" lies in its effectiveness in converting souls. It is not clear, on these grounds, why the Church *ought* to be outwardly united. The fact is, Forsyth is frightened by what he believes to be the Catholic doctrine of grace; and one looks in vain in his book for a real attempt at reconciliation. "There are but two alternatives, an evangelical Church and a sacramental—*i.e.*, a Church with the Word uppermost or a Church with the rite" (p. 26). But are there? Anglicanism stands or falls by its faith that there is a third way.

Few readers are likely to follow Dr Hitchcock's rambling arguments against Transubstantiation as far as p. 65. But those who do will have the suspicion already in their minds confirmed by the author's own assurance, "There is no intention here on the part of this writer to go deeply into this question."

R. Cant.

St Chad's College,
Durham.

The Worship of the English Puritans. By Horton Davies. Dacre Press. 25s.

It must be exceedingly embarrassing to a young man, recently appointed to his first Chair, to see himself described by his publishers as "the great Congregational Professor of Divinity." Dr Davies has, however, no cause to blush for this admirable product of his learning and research now given to the public. It is an invaluable contribution to a study which, until late years, has suffered long neglect, and it should lead to a good many revisions of opinion.

The book formed his thesis for the Oxford D.Phil. degree, but, in publishing it, Dr Davies has deeply at heart the double purpose of making the ordinary members of the Reformed (Genevan) Churches in Britain more alive to their liturgical tradition, and of drawing the attention of other Churches to the principles of that tradition and their bearing on the question of reunion. It would probably be difficult to compute which of these two groups is the more ignorant of the historical facts which his evidence establishes. Until these ignorances are removed, there can be little hope of mutual understanding; and one great merit of this book is that it does not require a specialist to read it with pleasure and profit.

In Chapter I. Dr Davies defines Puritanism, and argues that, broadly, Anglican worship derives from Luther and Puritan worship from Calvin; and in Chapter II. he discusses both the common theological ground of Lutheranism and Calvinism and their differences, which spring mainly from a different interpretation of the

authority of the Bible. Chapter III. shows how the liturgical movement characterized by the Reformed liturgies of Geneva and Strassburg spread to Britain. This is followed, in Chapter IV., by a very interesting examination of Durel's contention (he was Pastor of the French Church in the Savoy) that the Anglicans followed the pattern of the Continental Reformed Churches more closely than did the Puritans. Chapter V. expounds the Puritan belief that the Bible formed the only legitimate directory of worship, and shows in detail how this principle was interpreted. Chapters VI. to VIII. deal respectively with the Puritan criticism of the B.C.P., the worship of the English Separatists, and Puritan views on the question of set forms or extemporary prayer. Chapter IX. is a full and most excellent account of Puritan Service Books, and it is followed by five chapters treating, in turn, of Puritan psalmody, preaching, administration of the Sacraments, ordinations, and exercise of ecclesiastical discipline. The final chapter is devoted to a general survey and critique of Puritan worship. There are four appendixes, of which the first—a comparative analysis of Puritan liturgies—is of quite outstanding value. There is also a useful bibliography.

The foregoing brief summary of the contents of the book does little justice to the wealth of illustration provided and to the amount of material which will be unfamiliar to most readers. Dr Davies sets out his evidence with scholarly impartiality, and, when he does allow himself to comment, his judgments are balanced and urbane.

The thesis origin of the book does not obtrude excessively, though it is betrayed here and there by lack of proper liaison between the parts, shown, *e.g.*, by too frequent repetitions of what has already been adequately stated earlier. The title "Puritan" causes Dr Davies trouble, as well it may, for it is difficult to avoid misunderstanding when "Puritan" and "Anglican" are treated as mutually exclusive terms, and also "Puritan" and "Separatist." There is much to be said for Bernard Manning's preference for "Genevan" to describe the party whose worship is the subject of this book.

The author supports the claim of the seventeenth-century Independents that they were not Separatists, but yet refers, on p. 168, to "Browne, the father of the Independents." His use of the term "Anabaptist" is very obscure. Sometimes he seems to be treating it as interchangeable with "Baptist." Such obscurities and apparent confusions are, however, very small blemishes in what is not only a fine piece of work but a timely one.

E. R. Micklem.

Gerrard's Cross.

Protestant Dissent in Ireland (1687-1780). By J. C. Beckett. Faber and Faber. 15s.

In this carefully documented and scholarly work Mr Beckett gives with admirable clarity a picture of the strength and distribution of Protestant dissent in Ireland, of its grievances and demands, and of its complicated relationship with the Irish Government and the English ministry. The first part contains a chronological survey

from the Revolution to the repeal of the Sacramental Test in 1780: the second deals thoroughly with special topics—Regium Donum, Presbyterian marriages, the minor sects, and the economic status of the Protestant dissenters. The Presbyterians in the north-east formed the major part of the Protestant dissenters. "They were Scots, and their church was part of the Scottish national church." In spite of the author's laudable determination to be unbiased, we seem to read much of the bigotry of Irish high churchmen and little of the intolerance of Presbyterians, "whose avowed principle," declared King, "it is to tolerate nobody when they are in power." Swift had read "above fifty pamphlets by as many Presbyterian divines, loudly disclaiming this *idol* toleration, some calling it *a rag of popery*, and all agreeing it was *to establish iniquity by a law*." In Scotland they were in power, and they were persecuting Episcopalians: in Ireland they had from the Restoration agitated for the abolition of episcopacy. For such perversity their self-preserving co-operation during the Revolution could not atone. Indeed, King and Swift had far stronger reason than Fowler had in 1780 to fear that the removal of the Sacramental Test (imposed in 1704) would lead to their usurpation and persecution of the national church. At all costs they must be kept out of power; but even so, compared with Scottish episcopalians, they had practical toleration, the Regium Donum, and little to complain of. Irish churchmen were at one with Swift in regarding episcopacy as "a divine and apostolical institution." And when Mr Beckett accuses them of inconsistency and lack of conviction in accepting unconditional toleration for non-conforming French Protestants (p. 16), he overlooks the traditional Anglican distinction, so clearly made by Ussher, Bramhall, Hopkins, Wetenhall, and King, between Continental Protestants in separation from an unreformed church, and dissenters at home who weakened the Protestant front in their separation from a reformed church. King also makes a similar distinction between "the present dissenters," who, by separating themselves from their lawful bishops, "are not Catholic members of the church," and "the first reformers," who, being bishops, "were accountable to no superior but Jesus Christ" (*An Answer . . . to Peter Manby*, pp. 6, 29). It is curious that from a book against popery Mr Beckett should select such a moderate statement of church principles "as displaying a bitter hostility to Protestant dissenters" (p. 20 and n. 3). A still more complete picture would have been given had the period selected by Mr Beckett been less restricted and notice taken of Ussher's scheme of church government, of the scheme proposed in 1799 for a university of Armagh in which Presbyterians were to have a considerable share of scholarships, fellowships, and professorships, of Jebb's desire to keep the Methodists within the church, and of the disendowment of the ancient Catholic and Apostolic Church of the land.

F. R. Bolton.

East Markham.

SHORTER NOTICES

A Philosophy of the Christian Revelation. By Edwin Lewis. Epworth Press. 15s.

The Dark Knowledge of God. By Charles Journet. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

The first of these books is a philosophical and orthodox treatment of the Christian doctrine of Revelation. It is written by the Professor of Theology in Drew Theological Seminary. In spite of the tribute on the dustcover to the professor's persuasive style, the English reader will not find it easy; it is diffuse and lacks distinction.

The author occupies a theological position opposed to modernism, and showing the influence of Continental theologians. But his habit of summarizing the works of others does not assist the reader to form clear impressions of what he wants to say. In some places the book is little more than a collection of reviews—two pages for Kierkegaard, two for Barth, one and a half for Karl Heim, and so on. This is all rather wearisome, and when one comes upon the names of forty-seven theologians of different nationalities following each other like a string of sausages, the most polite reader may think it is too much. While it may be the case that such bad showmanship obscures the value of the goods for sale, it would be hard to find one passage which, for clarity of statement or depth of thought, could be classed as first-rate theological writing.

The second book comes from Switzerland by way of America. It is a short treatise on the knowledge of God, written by a Roman Catholic scholar, Professor Journet, and translated by James F. Anderson of Chicago. It follows the traditional scholastic approach to the subject, passing from natural to revealed theology, and then to mystical knowledge. As the title suggests, the author's purpose is to show the limitations of the first two ways of knowledge, and thus lead on to the experience of the mystics. The striking difference between this small work and Dr Baillie's book on the same subject is the place given to mystical rapture. The book is not easy to read; it is best fitted to those who combine a mystical temper with a knowledge of Roman Catholic theology.

A. C. Scupholme.

Ugthorpe.

The Early Methodist People. By Leslie F. Church. Epworth Press. 12s. 6d.

In this book the Connexional Editor of the Methodist Church depicts with affectionate enthusiasm and careful research the early Methodist people of the first two generations. Their fellowship in the class-meetings, their somewhat Puritan personal lives, their attitude to children and family life, and their building of the preach-

ing-places are here described, with a wealth of autobiographical accounts of their spiritual experience reminiscent of William James' *Varieties*. Another volume is promised on other aspects of their lives.

The tone of their religion shows striking differences from our own; but how much is Methodism, how much is eighteenth century? But the main contention of the book is amply vindicated; the evidence of their spiritual vitality is irresistible. Thus we see that the Methodist revival did not merely produce one outstanding leader, or even the whole company of travelling preachers, but powerfully changed the lives of multitudes of their followers. We see, too, how much of this was due to the preaching of perfection, now too lightly dismissed as heretical, and to the institution of the class-meeting. Clearly the Methodist mode of life was more distinctive than that of any major denomination today. This distinctiveness was perhaps partly excessive, and partly due to the debased standards of the secular life of that century—for instance, in the theatre; but this is an age in which many Christians are seeking with much justification a more distinctive way of life. Of the heritage here portrayed, modern Methodism has much to give, but also much to recover.

"Methodism," said one of the early Methodists here quoted, "is Church of Englandism *felt*." This quaint saying is perhaps not wholly fair to either side; yet it may serve to remind Anglicans and Methodists of their common interest in such a work as this.

A. Raymond George.

Wesley College,
Headingley.

Christ in His Mystical Body. By C. J. Woollen. Sands. 6s.

We Die Standing Up. By Dom Hubert Van Zeller, O.S.B. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

Mr Woollen's doctrine of the Church is the standard teaching of Roman Catholicism, and he claims as his guide the recent encyclical of Pope Pius XII—"Mystici Corporis Christi." Although the book contains much that is sound, it cannot be recommended for general reading among Anglicans.

Very different is the volume by Dom Hubert Van Zeller, who is a monk of Downside. An arresting title introduces forty-one short essays upon a variety of subjects: Prayer, Illness, Health, an "Engagement," Friendship, Work, etc. The author's style and understanding of the needs of the present day fill the reader with a desire to see the projected companion volume, *We Live with Our Eyes Open*.

J. L. Badger.

Bridlington.

INDEX TO VOLUME LI

JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1948

PAGE

Ad Vestem Sacerdotis 332
Alarming Difference, The 218
American Letter 419
Amsterdam, 1948 454
Anglican Church as Continental Churchmen see it, The 410
Annotations to the Psalms, The 52
Appalling Religiousness of America, The 42
Archbishop Wake and Intercommunion 176
Assumption of the Virgin and Papal Infallibility 327
BELGION, M. 218
BENNETT, V. 327
BLACKSTONE, B. 257
BLAKENEY, E. H. 261
BOLTON, F. R. 403

BOOKS REVIEWED (see also "Shorter Notices"):

Allen, *God's Action within the Soul* (H. K. Archdall) 192
Altmann, *Saadya Gaon* (F. H. Smith) 193
Artificial Human Insemination (G. D. Simms) 428
Attwater, *The Christian Churches of the East* (G. Every) 73
Bainton, *The Church of our Fathers* (R. Rouse) 351
Barrett, *The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition* (E. Evans) . . . 33
Barth, *Dogmatik in Grundriss* (F. W. Camfield) 27
Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter* (E. G. Selwyn) 104
Beckett, *Protestant Dissent in Ireland* (F. R. Bolton) 477
Berdyaev, *The Russian Idea* (D. R. Davies) 265
Bethell, *The Winter's Tale* (L. F. Casson) 113
Beza, *Heritage of Byzantium* (E. Every) 32
Bretall, *A Kierkegaard Anthology* (M. M'Gregor) 349
Brunner, *Revelation and Reason* (H. Cunliffe-Jones) 107
Burgmann, *The Church's Encounter with Civilization* (F. W. Camfield) . 388
Cadoux, *Philip of Spain and the Netherlands* (H. S. Deighton) . . . 197
Campbell, *The Life of the World to Come* (F. Bennett) 425
Casey, *The "De Incarnatione" of Athanasius* (S. L. Greenslade) . . . 317
Chaning-Pearce, *Soren Kierkegaard* (M. M'Gregor) 349
Cook, *What Baptists Stand For* (H. R. T. Brandreth) 33
Davies, *Episcopal Acts relating to Welsh Dioceses* (G. R. Dunstan) . . 152
Davies, *The Worship of the English Puritans* (E. R. Micklem) . . . 476
de Burgh, *The Legacy of the Ancient World* (C. W. Dugmore) . . . 158
Demant (Ed.), *Our Culture* (T. R. Milford) 312
d'Eypernon, *Les Paradoxes du Bouddhisme* (L. M. Schiff) 74
Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man* (G. O. Williams) 316
Eeles, *Notes on Episcopal Ornaments* (E. C. Ratcliff) 394
Études Carmélitaines (Bishop of Swansea and Brecon) 29
Farmer, *God and Men* (E. Knapp-Fisher) 315
Farner, *Ulrich Zwingli* (E. G. Rupp) 231
Forder, *The Parish Priest at Work* (A. M. Whitehead) 229
Forsyth, *The Church and the Sacraments* (R. Cant) 475
Forsyth, *The Work of Christ* (H. K. Archdall) 420
Graham, *The Christ of Catholicism* (J. H. Churchill) 347
Greene, *The Heart of the Matter* (M. Belgion) 396
Hebert, *The Authority of the Old Testament* (H. H. Rowley) . . . 69
Henderson, *Can Two Walk Together?* (H. Cunliffe-Jones) 313
Higham, *Frederick Denison Maurice* (J. H. Churchill) 238
Hitchcock, *Transubstantiation* (R. Cant) 475
Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel* (R. V. G. Tasker) 191
Jacob, *The Register of Henry Chichele* (N. Sykes) 233
Kean, *The Meaning of Existence* (B. S. Moss) 226

PAGE

Kingsbury, *The Way of Suffering* (G. K. Dovey) 353
Knight, *The Hebrew Prophetic Consciousness* (E. W. Heaton) . . . 308
Knox, *The Acts of the Apostles* (V. Taylor) 306
Knox, *The Book of Psalms* (H. de Candole) 271
Lawton, *Conflict in Christology* (I. T. Ramsey) 189
Lebreton and Zeiller, *The History of the Primitive Church* (W. O. Chadwick) . 76
Lee, *Groundwork of the Philosophy of Religion* (R. R. Hartford) . . . 390
McNeile, *Christianity in Southern Fenland* (S. Evans) 430
Messel, *Ezechielfragen* (H. F. D. Sparks) 31
Micklem, *The Sacred and the Secular* (F. W. Camfield) 388
Middleton, *Newman and Bloxam* (H. R. T. Brandreth) 234
Ministry of the Church (A. G. Hebert) 155
Moorman, *B. K. Cunningham* (A. Webster) 111
Morgan and Lloyd, *The Mission of the Anglican Communion* (C. K. Sansbury) 386
Mortimer, *The Elements of Moral Theology* (F. P. Harton) . . . 187
Mowinckel, *Prophecy and Tradition* (D. Winton Thomas) 36
Mowinckel, *Zur Frage nach Dok. Quellen in Jos. xiii-xix* (D. Winton Thomas) 37
Muller, *A History of Jewish Mysticism* (C. Witton-Davies) . . . 346
Newbigin, *The Reunion of the Church* (H. E. W. Turner) 266
Northcott, *Religious Liberty* (R. Rouse) 352
Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit and Ourselves* (H. Cunliffe-Jones) . . . 313
Orr, *A Sixteenth-Century Indian Mystic* (F. H. Smith) 429
Parkes, *Judaism and Christianity* (H. Charles) 474
Phillips, *Letters to Young Churches* (C. F. D. Moule) 235
Polanyi, *Science, Faith and Society* (D. A. Webb) 157
Prideaux, *The Making of Sermons* (T. O. Wedel) 269
Reckitt, *Maurice to Temple* (R. H. Preston) 195
Richardson, *Christian Apologetics* (G. W. H. Lampe) 228
Robinson, *The Administration of the Lord's Supper* (R. P. Symonds) . . 348
Robinson, *The Li e and Faith of the Baptists* (R. D. Middleton) . . . 34
Robinson, *Two Hebrew Prophets* (E. W. Heaton) 308
Rochester, Bishop of, *Five Questions before the Church* (F. Bennett) . . 112
Roth, *A Short History of the Jewish People* (H. Charles) 474
Rupp, *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition* (S. L. Greenslade) 159
Schenk, *The Concern for Social Justice* (H. Cunliffe-Jones) . . . 431
Simon, *Ahad Ha-am* (C. Witton-Davies) 270
Snaith, *The Jewish New Year Festival* (C. W. Dugmore) 392
Solovyev, *Lectures on Godmanhood* (G. Every) 472
Solovyev, *Russia and the Universal Church* (G. Every) 472
Stamm, *Das Lieden der Unschuldigen* (R. H. Fuller) 232
Stewart, *An Introduction to Jesus* (R. N. Whybray) 236
Sykes, *The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches* (Y. Brilioth) . . 185
Thompson, *The English Clergy in the Later Middle Ages* (N. Sykes) . . 109
Tomlin, *The Approach to Metaphysics* (I. T. Ramsey) 469
Trueblood, *Dr Johnson's Prayers* (Bishop of Swansea and Brecon) . . 237
Truro, Bishop of, *Towards a Better England* (F. Bennett) 112
Underwood, *A History of the English Baptists* (H. R. T. Brandreth) . . 35
Van Til, *The New Modernism* (A. Richardson) 30
Vann, *Awake in Heaven* (E. Knapp-Fisher) 315
Viewpoints (R. G. Lunt) 272
Warren (Ed.), *The Triumph of God* (A. Richardson) 344
Watson, *Let God be God!* (H. Cunliffe-Jones) 107
Wedel, *The Coming Great Church* (A. M. Ramsey) 310
Wickings, *The Good News* (R. N. Whybray) 236
Williamson, *The Arrow and the Sword* (S. L. Bethell) 71
Wood, *The Regal Power of the Church* (G. R. Dunstan) 393
Zander, *Dostoevsky* (G. Every) 472

Boycott, W. S. 60
Charles, H. 246

PAGE
Christians and Jews 246
Church and Marriage, The 170
Church in Wales, The 123
Church Union in S. India, Inauguration of 1
CLARKE, W. K. L. 163, 303
Correspondence . . . 66, 104, 150, 180, 262, 319, 341, 381, 424, 459
DAVIES, J. G. 178
DIX, G. 7, 249
Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Western Church, The 293
DUNSTAN, G. R. 22
Evangelicals and the Ministry, The 369
EVERY, G. 95, 145
HALIFAX, EARL OF 365
HANSON, A. 1
HARDMAN, O. 13, 45
HEBERT, A. G. 323
HENNELL, M. M. 376
Heresy in New Testament Times 288
HIND, BISHOP J. 207
Hosea and the Virgin Birth 373
JENKINS, D. 213
Justin Martyr and Confirmation 133
Lambeth Conference, The Development of 207
Land and Sacramental Theology, The 60
Lang and Temple 365
MACKERNESS, E. D. 333
MACMILLAN, A. T. 170
Martin Buber 301
MIDDLETON, R. D. 85
MONTIZAMBERT, E. 419
Moore, Aubrey 85
MORLEY, F. 288
Mr Pawley and the Nonconformists 213
New Translation of the Bible, A 303
NEWELL, H. W. 410
PARE, P. N. 293
PAWLEY, B. 139
Prayer Book Revision, Prospects and Principle of 13, 45
PRIDEAUX, S. P. T. 332
Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. 81
RAMSEY, A. M. 369
RATCLIFF, E. C. 133
Reunion, Some Practical Difficulties of 139, 343
Reunion: from Above or Below? 283
Revelation, The Problem of 89
Richard Mant 403
ROBINSON, J. A. T. 373
ROBINSON, N. H. G. 448
St Paul's Defence of his Apostolate 323
SANDERS, J. N. 89
"Seal" in the Second Century, The 7
"Shaliach" 166, 249, 341
Shorter Notices . 39, 77, 115, 160, 198, 239, 274, 318, 354, 397, 432, 479
S.P.C.K., Two Hundred and Fifty Years of 163
Studies in Texts 178, 261
Supply and Distribution of Assistant Curates, The 443
SWANSEA AND BRECON, BISHOP OF 123
SYKES, N. 176, 412
TOMKINS, O. S. 283
TOWNLEY, G. F. 443

PAGE

Tribute to Two Tractarians 455
TRURO, BISHOP OF 166
Universality of Sin, The 448
VIDLER, A. R. 42, 81, 201, 241
What is Anglicanism? 201, 241
"Why you should read it" 22, 257, 333, 376
William Temple, The Biography of 412
Williams, Charles 95, 145
WILSON, W. 52
With Me in Paradise 100
WITTON-DAVIES, C. 301

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALL SAINTS', MIDDLESBROUGH: *Seventy Years at All Saints', Middlesbrough,* 1878-1948 (2s. 6d.).

ALLEN AND UNWIN: C. Isherwood (Ed.), *Vendanta for the Western World* (16s.).

A.P.C.K. (DUBLIN): *Ireland and the Orthodox* (Report of a Conference in Dublin, October, 1947) (1s.).

BLACKFRIARS: F. C. Copleston, S.J., *Existentialism and Modern Man* (1s. 6d.).

BURNS OATES: R. A. Knox, *The New Testament* (New Library Edition) (12s. 6d.); G. D. Smith (Ed.), *The Teaching of the Catholic Church* (50s.).

CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS: *Infant Baptism Today* (6d.).

R. A. CIRLOT (3006 WHEELING STREET, EL PASO, TEXAS): Felix L. Cirlot, *Apostolic Succession: Is it True?* ($6.00).

DOBSON: Paul Claudel, *Lord, Teach us to Pray* (6s.).

DORSET C.C. EDUCATION COMMITTEE: Syllabus of Religious Instruction (2s. 6d.).

ÉDITIONS DE LA BACONNIÈRE (NEUCHÂTEL): J. D. Burger, *Saint Augustin, un père de l'église* (Fr. 8).

EPWORTH PRESS: Harry Escott (Ed.), *Isaac Watts's A Guide to Prayer* (5s.); Harry Escott (Ed.), *Peter Taylor Forsyth, Director of Souls* (selections from his practical writings) (6s.).

FABER: O. S. Wauchope, *Deviation into Sense* (12s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: Edward Shillito, *Poetry and Prayer* (2nd edn.) (4s.); A. P. Davis, *Isaac Watts* (8s. 6d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: H. C. G. Moule, *Charles Simeon* (first published in 1892) (6s.).

A. W. JORDAN (TRURO): F. W. B. Bullock, *A History of the Parish Church of St Mary, Truro* (8s. 6d.).

LUNDEQUISTSKA BOKHANDELN (UPPSALA): Gösta Hök, *Zinzendorfs Begriff der Religion* (10 kr.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: L. E. Elliott-Bins, *The Beginnings of Western Christendom* (25s.).

JOHN MURRAY: G. Maurice Elliott, *In Search of Faith* (6s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: H. A. Guy, *The New Testament Doctrine of the "Last Things"* (10s. 6d.).

ROCKCLIFF: Henri Talon, *William Law* (8s. 6d.).

SCHRIFTENMISSIONS-VERLAG (GLADBECK): Hans Ehrenberg, *Vom Menschen biblisch und aktuell* (n.p.).

SCHWABENVERLAG (STUTTGART): Ulrich Valeske, *Die Stunde ist Da: zum Gespräch zwischen den Konfessionen* (n.p.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Wilton Rix, *Family Prayers* (a little Service Book for parents and children) (2s. 6d.); Karl Jaspers, *The European Spirit* (2s. 6d.); Chad Walsh, *Stop Looking and Listen* (6s.); Wladimir Weidle, *The Dilemma of the Arts* (10s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher